

Reinventing Government:

Fast Bullets and Culture Changes

By Robert P. Hillmann

In early March 1993 President Clinton created what is now called the National Partnership for Reinventing Government (NPR) and named Vice President Al Gore to serve as his point man in a drive to reinvent government in the United States.¹ While on the surface it may appear to be nothing more than just another government management fad, it is anything but that.

Defining the Term Reinventing Government

The term "Reinventing Government" comes from a book with the same name written by David Osborne and Ted Gaebler. The concept however, has been in practice in the private sector since the mid 1980's where it is more commonly referred to as business process reengineering or simply reengineering. Today these terms are for the most part used interchangeably, although some in government still prefer to use the term reinvent as opposed to reengineer.

Trying to discover exactly what is meant by the term "reinventing government" is not an easy task. Much of what has been written about the subject gets bogged down in jargon that many of its users don't completely

understand. Jerry Mechling, director of the Program on Strategic Computing and Telecommunications in the Public Sector at Harvard University's Kennedy School of Government, is the author of one of the most clear and concise articles written on the subject. In an article for GOVERNING magazine Mechling refers to reinventing government as "Public- Sector Reengineering".² In explaining what reengineering is he simply states that "Reengineering is radical change".³ He then goes on to identify three elements necessary for reengineering to occur

- Fundamental change: "In a fundamental redesign, all steps in the process are subject to redesign; it is not reengineering if only a few steps are changed. The sweeping nature of the change distinguishes reengineering from other organizational change."⁴
- Rapid Progress toward radical goals: "True reengineering has radical goals that it intends to reach rapidly."⁵ "Incremental 'fixes' are not reengineering. Reengineering is revolution, not evolution, both in ends and means."⁶
- Selective use of appropriate information technology: It is the use of information technology that marks the true distinction between the terms reinventing government and reengineering government. While to reinvent government simply means to radically alter it, to reengineer it means to use computers and other information technologies to achieve the radical goals.⁷

Reengineering in the public sector is much more difficult than in the private sector. The reason for this is that very often it will "...require coordination and change across bureaucratic lines of authority."⁸ These bureaucratic lines can be corporate governmental boundaries as is the case with municipal governments, the constitutionally recognized boundaries

between the 50 states or the lines that separate the Executive, Legislative and Judicial branches of the federal government. They can also be the physical, economic and philosophical borders between sovereign nations. In fact, Mechling and company say that one of the major obstacles in the way of public-sector reengineering is "America's constitutionally embedded reluctance to authorize governmental innovations (the checks and balances which constrain government)".⁹ The net result is that governmental entities are able to resist radical change in ways that private sector organizations cannot.

Mechling says that, "In government the safest and even the fastest progress may often be made through small steps, rather than through reengineering. The revolutionary ends of reengineering are almost always valuable, but in government the risks of revolutionary means may be too high."¹⁰ In other words he is saying that you should remember that it is the radical change and not the reengineering process that is the goal. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers reinventing government bulletin board, NPRNews.COE, cautions military personnel in a similar way noting, "As necessary as organizational improvements are, there is a danger that we can implement the Performance Measurement Process and other reinventing efforts in a way that does not fit the demands of the new world order."¹¹ Clearly the military personnel are being told here that the goal of the

radical change that is to be effected has to do with the creation of a new world order and not with the organizational improvement that would also occur as a result of the reengineering process.

Once it is determined that reengineering is the proper way to make the radical change that is desired, the first thing that must be done is to carefully make preparations and gain support for the planned operation, keeping in mind that the more radical the change, the more opposition that will be encountered.¹² The opposition to reengineering projects generally comes from "insiders"-- people who are close to and aware of what is going on within the targeted institution and whose lives may be greatly affected by the outcome. Supporters on the other hand will come from two separate groups. The first of these, like its opponents, will come from insiders but this will be a relatively small group.¹³ "The second and larger group, however, is comprised of people who don't normally pay close attention. These 'outside' supporters get involved only if they think that there is an important issue to be resolved. They may not even notice small changes."¹⁴ Osborne and Gaebler make a similar comment in "Reinventing Government" when they state: "Just as Columbus never knew he had come upon a new continent, many of today's pioneers—from governors to city managers, teachers to social workers—do not understand the global significance of what they are doing."¹⁵ The last step in

the process is to quickly implement your plan. This approach is described as "slow trigger, fast bullet."¹⁶ Mechling put it all in a nutshell when he wrote:

Take your time to assess the situation and build readiness for a major shift, but once you start to implement, move fast. The advantage in radical change goes to the attacker. Consensus will typically be impossible: success comes to those who mobilize support and keep the opposition off balance.¹⁷

There is one exception to the rules regarding the implementation of a reengineering project. This happens when an outside event is so momentous that people become willing to accept change that under normal circumstances would never be permitted. The way that Mechling puts it is, "Once crises open the door, radical and rapid change can proceed."¹⁸

The last step in the process is to quickly implement your plan. This approach is described as "slow trigger, fast bullet."

If, as Mechling, Osborne and Gaebler assert, most government employees have no idea what reinventing government is all about, how is it that they play such a crucial role in its implementation? The answer is quite simple. They read about it in magazines—magazines that are supplied to any government employee from the chief clerk at the local town hall to the heads of government in Washington D.C. In many instances the government entity that the employee works for will not pay for the subscription; in such cases a

subscription is often supplied at no charge. Although there are numerous government trade journals and other such publications that deal with the subject, the three that directly address the issue of reengineering government are:

- GOVERNING - "*Governing* is a monthly magazine whose primary audience is state and local government officials: governors, legislators, mayors, city managers, council members and other elected, appointed and career officials. They are the men and women who set policy for and manage the day-to-day operations of cities, counties and states, as well as such governmental bodies as school boards and special districts."¹⁹ This journal deals more with the policy and implementation aspects of reengineering rather than the technological end.
- GOVERNMENT TECHNOLOGY - Like *Governing* magazine this journal is also targeted towards state and local government employees. While it does discuss policy issues, its main emphasis is on how to use information technologies to radically change government.²⁰
- GOVERNMENT EXECUTIVE - This publication is directed towards federal government employees of all types including the military. It deals primarily with policy and the implementation of change, as such it is useful to the local practitioner of reengineering also.²¹

In addition to these publications there are several other government and non-governmental organizations that work together to supply government employees with advice on how to radically alter the public landscape. The Kennedy Schools' Program on Strategic Computing and Telecommunications in the Public Sector is one example, some of the others are:

- Institute for Electronic Government, IBM Corporation - The IEG maintains an Internet site that bills it as a "global resource for government leaders" that will help educate them on how to eliminate "industrial-age government" institutions and replace them with what it calls the "art of government" through the use of information technology. This site is updated quite often.²²

- Alliance for Redesigning Government - Founded in 1993 and sponsored by the Institute for Electronic Government, General Electric, the Pew Charitable Trusts and other foundations, "The Alliance is the center of a national network and clearing house for state, local and federal innovators; nonprofit and corporate leaders; and scholars who advocate performance-based, results-driven governance."²³

- National Partnership for Reinventing Government - The National Partnership for Reinventing Government (NPR) began life as the National Performance Review when President Clinton created it on March 3, 1993 and named Al Gore as its head. In June of that year Gore sponsored the first Service to the Citizens Conference in Richmond, Virginia. The three most important conclusions that the conference came to were:
 1. Information technology should be used to create a single government.

 2. A national identity card would be necessary and it must be an integrated access card or as it is more commonly referred to as a "smart card".

 3. That legislative action should be avoided while implementing the program.²⁴

History of Reinventing Government

In order to fully grasp the meaning of the term "reinventing government" you must first study its history. The origins of this process are somewhat obscured. John Kemensky, of the Vice President's NPR staff, in an article for *Public Administration Review* acknowledges that the reinventing process began in the private sector but says little more about its history.²⁵ In the same issue, James D. Carroll of Florida International University traces its history back to the 1930's.²⁶ Paul Strassman, adjunct professor at the National Defense University and the U.S. Military Academy at West Point says that reengineering has been "...practiced as a formal discipline since the early 1920's. Then it was known as 'Methods and Procedure Analysis'.²⁷

It is a *Forbes* magazine article that provides the most valuable insight into its origins. In it Mary Parker Follett, an early 20th century educator and business management consultant from Boston, is identified as being the "mother" of reinventing government theory. The author further cites management theorist, Peter Drucker, and London School of Economics chairman, Sir Peter Parker, as being in agreement with her on this point.²⁸ Among Folletts friends and supporters were some of the wealthiest and influential people in Boston including the Cabot and Shaw families, businessman Henry Dennison and the wife of Supreme Court Justice, Louis Brandeis.²⁹ In addition to the very wealthy, she also numbered among her

acquaintances the academic elite of Boston. Albert Bushnell Hart, professor of history at Harvard University and president of both the American Historical Association and the American Political Science Association was among this group.³⁰

Mary Parker Follett is identified as being the "mother" of reinventing government theory.

As World War I was coming to a close, communists and radicals of every stripe were laying the groundwork for a socialist world government that they hoped would emerge from the ruins of the old world order. As it turns out, large banking interests and others of great wealth, in Britain and the United States, were thinking along similar lines—of course their brand of socialism would have two classes not one. In 1918, with the help of Albert Bushnell Hart, Follett wrote a book called *The New State: Group Organization the Solution of Popular Government*. In which she outlined the social, political and educational requirements necessary to build a world government and it was the banking interests to which it was addressed.³¹

Follett's political philosophy was based upon the teachings of 19th century Oxford University fine arts professor John Ruskin. In 1870 Ruskin began teaching the children of England's elite at Oxford University that if they

did not extend their way of life to the lower classes of not only England but to the non-English-speaking world as well, ignorant commoners would eventually overwhelm their civilization.³² During this same period Karl Marx was predicting the violent overthrow of the bourgeoisie by the proletariat. The choice for the Victorian elite was a simple one—give up a little wealth and remain in control or wait for the masses to revolt.

Early followers of Ruskin, like Arnold Toynbee, Alfred Milner and others teamed up to form the first settlement house in London--Toynbee Hall. This would eventually serve as the model for thousands of other such institutions including Hull House in Chicago. By 1891, British social reformer William T. Stead, brought the Milner group together with a wealthy South African named Cecil Rhodes--another of Ruskins students. Together they began laying the groundwork for the creation of a union of all English-speaking nations, including the United States, based upon the Ruskin philosophy. This federation would then, according to their plan, benevolently rule the rest of the habitable world.³³ According to historian, Carroll Quigley, when Rhodes died in 1902 he left a considerable part of his fortune to fund "...the Rhodes scholarships at Oxford in order to spread the English ruling class tradition throughout the English-speaking world as Ruskin had wanted."³⁴

Ruskin's ideas quickly spread throughout the English-speaking world including the United States where certain wealthy families, in the northeast, had begun to view themselves as the American equivalent of the English ruling class. It was during this period that Henry Cabot Lodge proclaimed America "an aristocratic republic."³⁵ By the late 1890's American educators such as John Dewey, J.E. Russell--both of Columbia University--and Woodrow Wilson of Princeton University joined with wealthy businessmen such as Andrew Carnegie, J.P. Morgan and John D. Rockefeller in pursuing this globally oriented agenda.

...common people would need to be specially educated to accept not only a world government but their new station in life as well.

Before such a plan could be implemented, however, common people would need to be specially educated to accept both an international government and their new station in life. One of the ways advocated to accomplish this task was to edit history books to reflect a more global perspective. This idea was first put forward at the first Universal Peace Conference in 1889.³⁶

Early proponents of internationalism felt confident that the American people could be quickly educated into accepting such a system. At the

beginning of the 20th century as ordinary Americans, in large numbers, began to attend high school for the first time it was decided that the traditional liberal arts curriculum would be dropped in favor of what John Dewey called "industrial education".³⁷ The primary goal of industrial education was to divide people into two classes. Woodrow Wilson, president of Princeton University, in a speech to the Federation of High School Teachers said that, "We want one class of persons to have a liberal education and we want another class of persons, a very much larger class of necessity in every society, to forgo the privilege of a liberal education and fit themselves to perform specific difficult manual tasks."³⁸

In order for a two-class society to properly function the lower class would have to forgo more than just a liberal education—they would also have to give up their individual rights.

Under the old system children were taught, in their history classes, about how people came to America in search of religious freedom and how they fought a revolutionary war to escape tyranny. They were also taught about the Constitution and its Bill of Rights. This was to come to an end. In order for a two-class society to properly function the lower class would have to forgo more than just a liberal education—they would also have to give up their individual rights. In order to achieve this, the history of the Republic could no

longer be taught the way it he had been in the past. Walter Karp, contributing editor of *Harper's* magazine, commenting on industrial education stated that, "With economic "interdependence" as its subject and a "socialized" worker as its goal the new "democratic" curriculum had little place for history. For political history, which recounts the diverse deeds of men, there was to be no place at all."³⁹ The National Education Association (NEA) went so far as to advocate the elimination of all history courses and replacing them with social study courses.⁴⁰ Karp noted that:

To replace political history with Deweyite social studies was the perfect means of meeting the educational requirements of the powerful. In social studies, American youngsters would learn that America was chiefly an industrial system and not a republic at all, that a "good citizen" is a worker who gets up when the alarm clock rings and speeds to his job on time. In social studies, too, they would learn that the "real" history of America is the "development" of American industry--history without politics in it, which teaches the most corrupt of political lessons, that politics does not matter.⁴¹

By 1911 Dewey and the others realized that this particular attempt to radically alter the public landscape had failed and that it would be necessary to make their attack from another direction.⁴² That same year Albert Bushnell Hart wrote that, "One of the chief obstacles in the way of a better international understanding is the patriotic historian who brings into the limelight the prowess and conquest of his own race of people as against rival races."⁴³ Hart, an Anglophile, had his own ax to grind in this matter. Coming

from the Ruskin school of thought, he believed that the history books should be slanted in such a way as to make a union between the United States and the British Commonwealth more desirable to Americans.⁴⁴

Hart was not the only American educator advocating the alteration of the history books to reflect a kinder and gentler attitude toward Great Britain, numerous others joined him, among them were: Arthur M. Schlesinger, David S. Muzzey, H. Morse Stephens, Andrew McLaughlin, Claude Van Tyne and Owen Wister.⁴⁵ American Ambassador to Great Britain, Walter Hines Page, also aided in this effort by helping Englishman, Evelyn Wrench, founder of the English-Speaking Union, to organize a chapter here in the United States.⁴⁶ At this point in time however, the sun was already beginning to set on the British Empire and although an English-speaking union that would dominate the rest of the world would be discussed throughout the 1920's and 1930's—its time had already passed.

By the end of World War I textbook authors had been quietly editing their books for almost ten years.⁴⁷ Woodrow Wilson's call for a League of Nations intensified this movement dramatically—both here and in Europe. In 1919 socialist author Anatole France became so excited about the prospect of re-writing the history books that while speaking before the French Congress of

Elementary School Teachers, he shouted, "Burn the books, they teach hate, burn them all."⁴⁸

Follett felt that government based on individual rights had no place in modern political theory and disliked the system of checks and balances because it prevented power from being concentrated in the hands of a small group of people.

It was at this point that Follett's Book *The New State* made its debut. The world government that Follett advocated was to be a democracy but it would differ in some respects from democracy as most people then understood it. She summed up her feelings on the subject in the following manner, "From the Middle Ages the appreciation of the individual has steadily grown. The Reformation in the sixteenth century was an individualistic movement. The apotheosis of the individual, however, soon led us astray, involving as it did an entirely erroneous notion of the relation of the individual to society, and gave us the false political philosophy of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries."⁴⁹ She considered the entire concept of the United States, from its Declaration of Independence to its Constitution—especially the Bill of Rights—to be part of this false political philosophy and therefore detrimental to the cause of world government.⁵⁰ She felt that government based on individual rights had no place in modern political theory and disliked the system of checks and balances because it prevented power from being concentrated in

the hands a small group of people.⁵¹ In order to correct this situation, she felt that, "We must reinterpret or restate the fundamental principles of democracy."⁵²

Principles of the New State

In seventeenth and eighteenth century theory of democracy it was the individual that was considered to be the base unit of society and therefore it was individual rights that were paramount in documents like the U.S. Constitution. Follett referred to this system as a social contract. According to Follett, "The social contract theory was based on the idea of the state as an aggregate of units; it therefore followed that the rights of those units must be maintained. Thus individual rights became a kind of contractual rights."⁵³ Follett went on to state that "But there is no such thing as the 'individual'..."⁵⁴ and since there was no such thing as the individual, it would naturally follow there should be no such thing as individual rights.⁵⁵

The concept of individual rights had many flaws according to Follett's political philosophy not least of which was the fact that they believed that people were too stupid to make an informed decision. This led to the realization that any system of government allowing an individual to participate in the decision making process by having the right to vote, could not but help being flawed itself. Follett referred to this as "*la force stupide de nombre*"⁵⁶ So

vehement was she against the concept of an individual having the right to vote that in her introduction to **The New State** she proclaimed that, "Ballot-box democracy is what this book is written to oppose."

...eliminate the individual as the basic unit of society and replace him with group organizations.

The solution to this problem, according to Follett, was to eliminate the individual as the basic unit of society and replace him with group organizations: She noted that "Group organization is to be the new method of politics, the basis of our future industrial system, the foundation of international order."⁵⁷ There were to be a whole series of groups that, together, would form this new international order beginning with the world government at the top and reaching all the way down to local neighborhood groups. In between there were to be national, state, local, occupational and numerous other undefined groups all of which combined would replace the individual at the ballot box.⁵⁸ Group rights would now take the place of individual rights. Under the old order, man was endowed with certain God given rights—under the new system the only rights that man had were those that the group would bestow upon him.⁵⁹ "The state was now not to be

subordinate to the individual, but it was to be the fulfillment of the individual.

Man was to get his rights and his liberty from membership in society."⁶⁰

"The state was now not to be subordinate to the individual, but it was to be the fulfillment of the individual. Man was to get his rights and his liberty from membership in society."

Another interesting characteristic of this new democracy was the interlocking nature that these groups were to have. Follett noted that, "Society, however, does not consist merely of the union of all these various groups. There is a more subtle process going on--the interlocking of groups. And in these interlocking groups we have not only the same people taking up different activities, but actually representing different interests."⁶¹ The real significance of the interlocking group, however, only became apparent when the directorates of these organizations were also interlocked. This makes it possible for a very small number of people to control a very large number of groups.

[Interlocking groups] make it possible for a very small number of people to control a very large number of groups.

In Folletts vision of democracy there would be two classes of people... "those that govern and those that are governed."⁶² Those that were to govern

would be part of an aristocracy. Follett wrote that, "Democracy, I have said is not antithetical to aristocracy, but includes aristocracy. And it does not include it accidentally, as it were, but aristocracy is a necessary part of democracy."⁶³ The aristocracy that Follett was referring to was to be made up of a few "experts" It was into the hands of these experts that government was to be concentrated⁶⁴ and they were to have control over every aspect of people's lives.⁶⁵

Educating the People to Live in a New World Order

Follett believed that world government could not be forced upon people from the top down but rather that it must begin at the bottom and then work its way up.⁶⁶ She also believed that people would have to be educated in its ideals before it could be fully implemented. She was not opposed to socialism for the masses if that would further the ends of world government but she was against the concept of radical change through violent revolution. She cautioned socialists of her day telling them: "The wish for socialism is a longing for the ideal state, but it is embraced often by impatient people who want to take a short cut to the ideal state. That state must be grown—its branches will widen as its roots spread. The socialization of property must not precede the socialization of the will."⁶⁷ She went on to say that, "We all need not merely opportunities to exercise democracy, but opportunity for a training in democracy. We are not going to take any kind of citizen for the new state,

we intend to grow our own citizens."⁶⁸ In order to achieve this goal—a socialized will—it would be necessary to train people from cradle to grave.

Follett summed up the new education process as follows:

The training for the new democracy must be from the cradle through nursery, school and play, and on and on through every activity of our life. Citizenship is not to be learned in good government classes or current events courses or lessons in civics. It is to be acquired only through those modes of living and acting which shall teach us how to grow the social consciousness. This should be the object of all day school education, of all night school education, of all our supervised recreation, of all our family life, of our club life, of our civic life.⁶⁹

In order to achieve this goal-a socialized will-it would be necessary to train people from cradle to grave.

There are three main differences between the system that Follett described and socialism as Marx, Lenin, Stalin and other 19th and 20th century communist leaders viewed it. The first was the creation of the "socialized will". This could only be achieved over a long period of time using incremental adjustments. Communist leaders on the other hand believed that it could be accomplished quickly from the top down, first by violent revolution and then the elimination of anyone left that disagreed with them. This ideological difference between Folletts "New State" and that of Marx and the others is one of mechanics--not morality.

Follett advocated an aristocracy to rule over what she referred to as the "mob".

The second difference between the two was that while most socialist and communist leaders believed in a classless society, Follett advocated an aristocracy to rule over what she referred to as the "mob". This is an important distinction because it explains why large moneyed interests were so involved in what appeared to be a global socialist revolution.

The third difference between Follett and socialist leaders like Lenin and Stalin is not as apparent as the other two. It involves the route that the Russian Revolution took after its initial success. Vladimir I. Lenin began forming a socialist nation-state from which revolution could be exported to capitalist countries around the globe. Joseph Stalin continued to expand on this program causing a rift between those that believed in world government as the primary goal of their efforts and those who saw socialism as their primary goal.⁷⁰

The Inquiry

While Follett was busy outlining plans for how individuals were to be governed in the new order, others were making plans to structure the coming peace in such a way that a world government would be sure to emerge when the war was over. On 02 September 1917, President Woodrow Wilson wrote

to close friend and advisor, Col. Edward M. House, asking him to organize a group of men to outline U.S. plans for the post war world. House quickly accepted the task and was given a free hand to organize such a group without interference from Secretary of State Robert Lansing. This organization became known as The Inquiry.⁷¹

Col. House carefully chose the people that were to be part of The Inquiry. Among them were Columbia University professor James T. Shotwell, *New Republic* writer Walter Lippmann, Isaiah Bowman of the American Geographical Society, numerous other intellectual luminaries, trusted business associates and relatives.⁷² In late 1917 President Wilson asked him to have his group put together a report outlining U.S. war aims in order to help prepare for a speech that he intended to give sometime after Christmas. The requested information was delivered to Wilson in a meeting with House on 04 January 1918. In the report was a reference to a League of Nations being formed following the war. The idea of creating such an organization was not new but apparently they felt that the time was ripe to announce their intentions. The two men continued discussing the subject for several days and out of these discussions came the material for his famed "Fourteen Points" speech, which was delivered before Congress on 08

January 1918.⁷³ It was in this speech that Wilson first proposed the creation of the League of Nations.

By the time the American delegation arrived at the Paris Peace Conference, in December 1918, Col. House and the President had had a falling out and Secretary of State Lansing now took personal charge of The Inquiry.⁷⁴ The fact that House was out of the way and that he was now in charge of the planning body came as no consolation to Lansing because Wilson was not listening to him either. The President had decided to handle the negotiations without the assistance of either of them.⁷⁵ This left the Inquiry group with little to do but discuss things amongst themselves. Members of this elite debating society included: The Dulles brothers (John Foster and Allen), Samuel Eliot Morison, Walter Lippman, William Allen White, Lincoln Steffens, English economist John Maynard Keynes and others.⁷⁶

Post War Institutions Formed to Promote World Government

When the Paris Peace Conference was finally over, Wilson's League was part of the treaty but little else of his dream was. To make matters worse the U.S. Senate refused to ratify it and since the Covenant of the League of Nations was part of the treaty, it also was rejected. Wilson was devastated, emotionally and physically. He never recovered from the blow that he had been dealt. The staff of The Inquiry however, was more determined than ever

to see his dream of a world government come to fruition and many of its members spent the next twenty-five years working tirelessly to get the U.S. to participate in a world organization.⁷⁷ The immediate result of their efforts was the founding of two organizations—the Council on Foreign Relations and the Royal Institute of International affairs. The Royal Institute originated in Britain, an offshoot of another organization there known as the Round Table group and the Council on Foreign Relations was organized by an American group that Carroll Quigley referred to as the "Eastern Establishment".

J.P. Morgan originally dominated the Council on Foreign Relations. Some Morgan operatives that played key roles in the organization were: Thomas W. Lamont, John W. Davis, Isaiah Bowman, Allen and John Foster Dulles, James T. Shotwell, and Stephen P. Duggan. While the House of Morgan may have originally been the most important player in this game here in America, it was really only a case of being first among equals--other large banking interests and wealthy individuals were also involved. Among this group was John D. Rockefeller, Julius Rosenwald of Sears Roebuck and the Harris family (Harris Bank in Chicago).

The Council on Foreign Relations and the Royal Institute of International Affairs were only the first of many such organizations to come--all of which had as their primary goal: the education of people in the necessity of world government.

The Council on Foreign Relations and the Royal Institute of International Affairs were only the first of many such organizations to come—all of which had as their primary goal: the education of people in the necessity of world government. These groups would also be interlocked as Follett suggested. In the period 1919 through 1923, three other key organizations came into being: the Institute of Pacific Relations, the League of Nations Association and the Norman Wait Harris Memorial Foundation.

The Institute of Pacific Relations

The origins of the Institute of Pacific Relations (IPR) are somewhat clouded. In 1929 University of Chicago professor of international law, Quincy Wright, gave the following account of its origins: "The Institute of Pacific Relations was organized in 1925 among unofficial groups in several countries washed by the Pacific, to study the political, economic and social problems presented by the contacts of the diverse civilizations in that area."⁷⁸ Carroll Quigley, in a remarkably similar account of its origins went a little further noting that the IPR, the Royal Institute and the Council on Foreign Relations were interlocked organizations.⁷⁹

Professor Paul Hooper of the University of Hawaii, however, gives a much more revealing account of its history in an article called *A Brief History*

*of the Institute of Pacific Relations.*⁸⁰ Hooper notes that the YMCA first organized the group in 1919, with Honolulu as the planned site for a conference that was to find "a common basis of understanding and motivation for the Pacific peoples."⁸¹ Things went along slowly at first and it wasn't until 1923 that it was decided that this conference should be a short-term institute that would be comprised of various round-table discussion groups made up of prominent individuals from the area. International leaders of the YMCA, meeting in Austria, quickly endorsed the idea and made plans to expand the institute, which was now scheduled to be held in July of 1925, to include representatives from several other nations. The IPR agenda was also expanded at this time to include the study of the "biological and social effects of race mixture" and the planned cooperation with other groups that had goals similar to their own.⁸² By the time that the conference was held in July of 1925 the YMCA had relinquished control of the organization and at the conference the delegates created a permanent organization, that would also be known as the Institute of Pacific Relations.⁸³

The League of Nations Association

On 10 January 1923 two groups, the American Association for International Cooperation and the League of Nations Non-Partisan Committee were merged and became known as the League of Nations Non-Partisan Association. This name was eventually shortened to simply the League of

Nations Association (LNA). Raymond B. Fosdick, an American, who had served as the under secretary-general of the League of Nations until he resigned after the U.S. Senate refused to ratify the peace treaty, was instrumental in organizing the group and later served as its president.⁸⁴ The League of Nations Association, which still exists today as United Nations Association of the United States of America (UNA--USA), can also claim numerous other prominent individuals among its membership, among them: John W. Davis, Thomas W. Lamont, Adlai Stevenson, Douglas Fairbanks Jr, Sumner Welles and Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt. Also involved with this organization were Quincy Wright, James T. Shotwell and a former student of Wright's, Clark Eichelbeger.⁸⁵

The Norman Wait Harris Foundation

The Norman Wait Harris Foundation was typical of the internationally oriented institutions that popped up in the early 1920's. The foundation was donated to the University of Chicago by the heirs to the Harris Trust Company fortune that came in the form of a \$150,000.00 grant and was to be run by a committee chosen by the President of the University of Chicago.⁸⁶ "The purpose of the Foundation, as stated in the letter of gift, is 'the promotion of a better understanding on the part of American Citizens of the other peoples of the world, thus establishing a basis for improved international relations and a more enlightened world order.'⁸⁷

The audience for this group was to be different from that of the Council on Foreign Relations in that it would not be geared towards informing individuals from the general public on matters of international significance but rather would concentrate its efforts on those in academia.⁸⁸ The format was to be an annual institute that would use round table discussions to enlighten its attendees on issues of world order. "Institutes were to be held each summer where students and teachers from around the country but particularly those in the mid-west could be lectured by prominent individuals about international issues which they then would carry back to their own universities for further dissemination."⁸⁹ The use of round table groups was common to many of these globally oriented organizations, the reason being that it was thought that this would help promote "group thought" which in turn would "minimize biases in the approaches to international problems."⁹⁰ Mary Parker Follett considered "group thought" to be one of the cornerstones upon which the world government was to be built.

One of the more unusual aspects of these institutes was that participants were promised that any statements that they made would not be attributed to them in newspaper accounts of the proceedings.⁹¹ This is an interesting proposition because not only were many of the media outlets aware of the activities of the Harris Foundation and other such groups but

very often they were invited to attend the institutes. On occasion, if they could not attend, they were sent not only copies of reports meant for public consumption but the confidential ones also.⁹² Tiffany Blake of the *Chicago Tribune*, after stating that she would not be able to attend the 1933 institute went on to say; "I hope I may be favored with a copy of the proceedings, which, of course, I shall respect as confidential."⁹³

The Harris Foundation was strictly a University of Chicago show and Quincy Wright was its ringmaster—and remained so throughout the 1920's, 30's, 40's and into the 1950's.⁹⁴ When the Harris Foundation held its annual institute it was viewed not just as a local item of interest but rather as a civic event--at least among those that were aware of its existence. Everybody at the University pitched in to help, including Prof. Paul H. Douglas a future U.S. Senator and Prof. Charles Merriam of the Social Science Research Council.⁹⁵ Local groups and institutions also contributed to this effort--the Chicago Council on Foreign Relations and the First National Bank of Chicago among them.⁹⁶

While each of these groups played an important role in the planning for world government, they also had something else in common—University of Chicago professor of international law, Quincy Wright. By following his activities in these three groups and their various spin-off organizations one

can trace not only the origins but also the evolution of internationalist planning and preparation for world government throughout most of the 20th century.

Revenue for these groups came, primarily, from two sources: the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace and Rockefeller Foundation grants.

The interlocking nature of these groups often makes it difficult to distinguish where the activity of one group ends and where another begins. In 1926, for example, Edward C. Carter of the Institute of Pacific Relations and Wright met in Chicago to begin planning some cooperative ventures between the IPR and the Harris Foundation.⁹⁷ A similar proposal was made in 1927 between Wright and Isabel McLaughlin concerning the activities of the Harris Foundation, the Chicago Council on Foreign Relations and the English-Speaking Union.⁹⁸ Letters outlining plans for one organization were sometimes written on the letterhead of another without any reference to the organization upon whose letterhead the plans were written. One of the best examples of this can be found in a letter from Stephen P. Duggan, written on Institute of International Education letterhead, to Robert M. Hutchins, President of the University of Chicago. In the letter Duggan makes the following comments:

Thank you for your letter of January 24th with its enclosure from Quincy Wright, whom I happen to know personally.

Professor Wright's position is in entire accordance with my own. I, too, am a director of the Institute of Pacific Relations and, as I wrote, approve very heartily of its modus operandi. I see no reason why my proposed inter-racial conference should not be postponed until 1931 and then held as a conference of the Harris Foundation. Contrary to what Professor Wright suggests, I have no desire to make this more popular than a conference of the Institute of Pacific Relations. On the contrary, I would make it less popular. I would have representatives of the different racial groups present, but would have it much smaller in number than either the Kyoto or the Honolulu Conferences.⁹⁹

Revenue for these groups came, primarily, from two sources: the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace and the Rockefeller Foundation—although there were other players involved such as the Harris family and Julius Rosenwald.¹⁰⁰ Duggan's letter to Hutchins also sheds a little light on the funding of these groups. In it he went on to note that:

Professor Wright suggests that I may have funds available to support the conference; I have not. Dr. Keppel, however, informed me that in all probability he would be willing to share in the expenses. I should certainly think that the President of the Rosenwald Foundation would also be willing, considering its interest in inter-racial problems and it may be that the Rockefeller interests could become interested. As several valuable persons have discussed this with me, I shall be glad to be kept informed about developments in Chicago, should you consider attempting to realize the conference.¹⁰¹

This being the case we will dispense with the fiction that these groups (with all their sub-organizations) acted in any way independent of each other but rather performed specific functions as prescribed by the Carnegie and Rockefeller foundations. According to Carroll Quigley, the work of these two

groups represents the pooling of resources by America's two richest men— J.P. Morgan and John D. Rockefeller.¹⁰²

Cooking the history books

The early 1920s was a growth period for the textbook revision program. In 1921 The Carnegie Endowment for International Peace began its own study of the history books and the following year the League of Nations entered the field with its International Committee on Intellectual Cooperation (ICIC). According to Merrill Hartshorn of the National Council for the Social Studies, "The ICIC planned a positive program for the future. It made recommendations to local school boards and to governments for official campaigns to revise textbooks, and requests for support were sent to major international governmental agencies."¹⁰³ In 1926 the League expanded this program by adopting what became known as the "Casares Resolution". Casares, the League's Spanish representative, realizing that it would be unacceptable to simply demand that textbooks reflect an international point of view, instead suggested that committees be set up in each country to review their own books and when an offending passage was found, they were to see to it that it was removed.¹⁰⁴ In addition to forming these national committees the resolution also set guidelines for them to follow, one of which stated; "It is strictly forbidden to make or except applications for emendations referring to personal views of a moral, political, or religious order."¹⁰⁵

The early 1920s were a growth period for the textbook revision program.

With all the activity that accompanied the textbook program, opposition to it was bound to appear sooner or later. The Hearst newspaper syndicate first began the assault on the program in 1921.¹⁰⁶ The following year Charles Grant Miller further fanned the flames with his book *Treason to the American Tradition: The Spirit of Benedict Arnold Reincarnated in United States History Revised in Textbooks*.¹⁰⁷ The most intense opposition to the program, however, would not appear until 1927 and then in a most unlikely place.

In 1915 the people of Chicago elected a mayor, William Hale Thompson, who firmly believed in the U.S. government, the American people and in general accepted the concept of democracy as defined by the founding fathers. Thompson's opposition to U.S. entry into WW I incurred the wrath of some the more internationally oriented professors at the University of Chicago. In 1919, Charles E. Merriam, professor of political science at the University and one of the founding members of the Social Science Research Council¹⁰⁸ ran against him.¹⁰⁹ Among Merriam's supporters were Harold L. Ickes and Jane Addams of Hull House.¹¹⁰ Merriam, however, was soundly defeated.¹¹¹ In Thompson's second term, he continued his opposition to the international agenda by opposing U.S. entry into the League of Nations.¹¹² As

his second term was coming to a close and he was preparing to run for a third, a scandal developed involving one of his top aides and he was forced to drop out of the race. This opened the way for Charles E. Merriam's "reform" candidate, William E. Dever, to succeed him as mayor.¹¹³ Merriam would serve Dever as a close, but unofficial, advisor.¹¹⁴

Early in Dever's term he was able to appoint seven members to the Chicago school board.[115] In 1924 they bypassed the logical candidate for the job of Superintendent of Chicago public schools[116] and instead appointed Merriam's candidate, William McAndrew, to the position.[117] This appointment was an unpopular one and eventually led to Dever being thrown out of office—the reason being McAndrew's insistence on using the revised history books written by Arthur M. Schlesinger and Albert Bushnell Hart.

By 1926, Parents and other individuals who were aware that the altered textbooks were being used in the Chicago Public Schools formed an organization called the Citizens Committee on School Histories. This group, made up primarily of lawyers, doctors and other professionals, approached Mayor Dever and requested that the offending books be removed from the schools but he ignored them and the books remained in use. They next approached former mayor, William Hale Thompson, who was planning another bid for the mayor's office and he entered the fray with fists flying.

Thompson, who had opposed internationalism throughout his political career, made the textbook issue one of the cornerstones of his campaign. Dever, Merriam and what was referred to by some as "The University of Chicago Brain Trust" never knew what hit them.¹¹⁸ In 1927 Thompson was re-elected to the mayors office, in a three-way race, with an absolute majority of the vote cast.¹¹⁹

One of the first items on Thompson's agenda was the removal of William McAndrew. This battle was long and drawn out with the pro-League of Nations media throughout the world, having a field day. Thompson was ridiculed in papers like the *New York Times*, the *London Daily Express* and the *Evening Standard*, but he continued his efforts to have McAndrew removed. The textbook issue soon moved into the Chicago Public Library where once again a book written by Albert Bushnell Hart came into question-- this time it was his *American Nation*.¹²⁰ This led to charges of book burning by his opponents. These charges, while untrue,¹²¹ were so widely reported in the press and other media outlets that even today a historian as eminent as Gary B. Nash states that, "Chicago's mayor, "Big Bill" Thompson, ordered Schlesinger's *New Viewpoints* burned on the steps of the Chicago Public Library in 1927."¹²²

Eventually Thompson won his battle against McAndrew and his textbooks but the victory was short-lived. In 1931, Anton Cermak, with the assistance of Merriam, Julius Rosenwald and Harold Ickes again defeated him.¹²³ Arthur M. Schlesinger gleefully noted the passing of this event in a letter to Merriam in which he said, "After reading your canned speech on the mayoralty campaign, I have made a mental resolve that before I run for high office I shall first make sure of your support. No wonder the [politically] late Bill Thompson lost out."¹²⁴

The school textbook issue is generally used to discredit Thompson and demonstrate that he was a buffoon. However, an exchange of letters between Quincy Wright, whom Merriam brought to the University of Chicago in 1923, and Edward C. Carter of the Institute of Pacific Relations seems to show otherwise. On 03 May 1932 Carter wrote to Wright stating:

I have recently had the privilege of talking this matter over very fully with Mrs. Welling and Dr. Embree, and they are going to see whether it is going to be possible in the next ten months or the next ten years to get anywhere from ten to one hundred public school teachers and authorities in the state of Illinois sensitized to the need of studying this whole problem. If we could have scattered through Illinois teachers who are conscious of the limitations of most textbooks and on the lookout not only for better textbooks but for the right kind of supplementary reading material, then two main things will result: First, we shall have teachers doing work in this field for themselves instead of having it done for them by some far distant group. Second, we shall have a group ready to use the results of anything that may come from California or New York or Nashville or from Chicago itself.¹²⁵

Wright's response to Carter was even more intriguing:

In regard to your discussion with Mrs. Welling and Dr. Embree, while of course, it would be valuable to make contacts with school teachers I think that our main influence would be through the text books. It is for this reason that I sincerely hope we may be able to acquire very concrete reports on the hundred or so history and geography texts most in use in this country. This would make possible a direct approach to authors and publishers. If one gets the right materials in the text books it controls the attitude of tens of thousands of teachers while direct contact with any considerable number of teachers is impossible.

But whether true or not I think it would be much wiser policy for the Institute to try to get changes in the books now in use than to seek to gain adoption in the schools of a particular text book. In view of the large financial interest involved in gaining adoption of a school text book any such effort would put the Institute under suspicion of having some 'special interest'.¹²⁶

With Thompson safely out of the way plans were now laid to take the textbook program on the road. Carter and Wright not only decided to expand it across the U.S., they also decided that the history books of China and Japan also were desperately in need of some editing.¹²⁷

A Hostile Takeover

While Thompson was busy battling Merriam, Wright and the blue pencil brigade in Chicago, an internal feud over the control of the Institute of Pacific Relations was beginning to develop. Due to the altered nature of the Institute following the 1925 conference, there were now two factions within it—the original Hawaiian and Pacific coast group and an eastern group.¹²⁸ This new group consisted of some of the most wealthy and politically connected people

in the east, among them: Mrs. John D. Rockefeller, Paul Warburg, Julius Rosenwald, Thomas W. Lamont of J.P. Morgan and Nicholas Murray Butler of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.¹²⁹ By the time that the IPR held its next conference, in 1927, almost half its grant money was coming from the Carnegie and Rockefeller foundations.¹³⁰ Along with the moneyed interests came the intellectuals that were closely associated with them, Isaiah Bowman, James T. Shotwell, Roger S. Greene, William Allen White, Walter Lippman, John W. Davis and University of Chicago professor, Quincy Wright among them.¹³¹

The 1928 Institute membership list consisted of 169 names and of these only 47 were from the West Coast. The remaining 122 members were almost exclusively from major eastern cities.¹³² As their numbers and influence in the organization grew the eastern contingent began to demand changes in the operations and goals of the group. This resulted in a dispute that simmered for a year or two before erupting into an open battle over control of the Institute. The battle continued until 1933 when Edward C. Carter, leader of the eastern contingent, assumed the position of Secretary General. Carter, who maintained close contact with Quincy Wright, then began filling the remaining key positions not already under their control with their supporters—among them Owen Lattimore and Frederick Vanderbilt Field, a member of the

wealthy Vanderbilt family who would eventually become known as the "Wall Street Red".¹³³ By 1935 the Institute was completely under the control the Eastern faction and its home was moved to New York.¹³⁴

FDR and International Socialism

The stock market crash of 1929 set in motion a series of events that energized the drive for world government. The great depression that followed the crash so completely undermined peoples confidence in Herbert Hoover, the Republican Party in general and Americas economic system that they elected Franklin Delano Roosevelt President in 1932.

The stock market crash of 1929 set in motion a series of events that energized the drive for world government.

Roosevelt, an ardent supporter of the League of Nations, was a committed internationalist. His political appointments reflected this internationalism and a close relationship between government officials and groups like the Council on Foreign Relations, the Institute of Pacific Relations, the League of Nations Association and the Harris Foundation quickly developed. This was particularly true in the State Department.

The relationship between these organizations and the U.S. government in the 1920's was cordial but not intimate. Throughout the 1920's there were

individuals in government that were in close contact with these groups. People like Arthur Schoenfeld of the U.S. Embassy in Mexico City,¹³⁵ and Herbert Feis moved quickly between jobs at the State Department and the Council on Foreign Relations,¹³⁶ but this did not reflect the feelings of then Secretary of State Frank Kellogg. Kellogg did not completely trust these groups and on at least one occasion ordered his people not to cooperate with them. This order came in the form of a confidential State Department memo from Kellogg to Schoenfeld, which he immediately forwarded to Wright.¹³⁷ Roosevelt's appointment of Cordell Hull as Secretary of State changed all this. Now not only were the actions of these groups tolerated but their input was eagerly sought. Wright and Hull developed a particularly close relationship.

The prospect of Roosevelt winning the 1932 Presidential election so thrilled the proponents of internationalism that they could barely control themselves—and in some cases they didn't. On 28 October 1932, Wright wrote to Professor Samuel N. Harper, a Harris Foundation trustee who greatly admired the Soviet model of socialism, to see if he could arrange for Leon Trotsky or Karl Radek to attend the Harris Institute on propaganda that was to be held in June 1933.¹³⁸

The timing of this particular Institute is interesting because it came at a time when Trotsky was looking for a place to live, having been banished from

the Soviet Union by Joseph Stalin. The main difference between the two was that Stalin believed in socialism based within one nation that could then be exported to other nations while Trotsky and his followers still believed in an international state. In 1933 Trotsky found a safe haven in France.¹³⁹ At about the same time Wright dropped him from his short list of guests and began to concentrate instead, on Karl Radek, a strong supporter of Trotsky's who had also spent time in exile. Radek was no stranger to the groups that Wright was involved with having had contact with the Council on Foreign Relations dating back to the early 1920's.¹⁴⁰

The first snag in getting Radek to the 1933 Institute developed when Boris Skvirsky, Wright's contact man with Moscow, asked for assurances that there would be no problems in obtaining a visa for him.¹⁴¹ Wright then contacted the State Department and was told that it was illegal to issue a visa to anyone affiliated with the Communist International and since the U.S. still did not recognize the Soviet Union he could not be brought in under any kind of diplomatic immunity either. The plan was originally conceived based upon the expectation that Roosevelt would recognize the Soviet Union immediately upon assuming office but apparently in anticipation of problems with the Congress, this action was delayed. When Wright finally realized that there was no way that he was going to get him into the U.S. he wrote Edward C.

Carter of the Institute of Pacific Relations to see if he could arrange an invitation for him to its conference in Bamff, Canada later in the year.¹⁴² This effort also failed.

In October of 1934 Wright and Samuel Harper both traveled to the Soviet Union and again an effort was made to bring Radek to the U.S.¹⁴³ Once again the stated reason for the request was to address a Harris Foundation Institute. This time the State Department relented and agreed to issue him a visa¹⁴⁴ but when the Institute convened in late June 1935 Radek was not among the Soviet guests. Instead they sent Alexander A. Troyanovsky, the Soviet ambassador to the U.S., Ivan V. Boyeff of the Amtorg Trading Company and Vladimir Romm of the Moscow Isvestia.¹⁴⁵

Things went slightly awry when the University of Chicago made its official announcement of scheduled events at the 1935 Institute. The *Chicago Tribune* ran an article the following day in which it was stated that the Harris Banking family controlled the agenda of the foundation. Furthermore, it commented on radical professors involved with the group and referred to an investigation by a state senate special committee into "subversive indoctrination at the University of Chicago."¹⁴⁶

Wright immediately wrote to Hayden B. Harris apologizing for the error, blaming a student on the campus that was employed as a reporter by

the *Tribune*.¹⁴⁷ A hint as to who really controlled the Harris Foundation can be found in a letter from Frederic C. Woodward, vice president of the University of Chicago, to Quincy Wright on 20 November 1926. Woodward wrote:

The President having found it impossible to see the founders of the Harris Memorial, I went down to the Harris Trust Company yesterday And presented to Mr. Hayden Harris the resolution relating to the future policy of the Foundation. He was very much interested and gave the policy his unqualified approval.¹⁴⁸

Woodward went on to note that, "He would like to see the problems of Russia taken up by the Foundation, but is inclined to agree with us that the time is not yet ripe."¹⁴⁹

The 1935 Institute turned out to be Wright's last chance to get Radek to the U.S. for an Institute—or anything else for that matter. The following year Stalin had him arrested for being involved in a plot to dismember the Soviet Union in a Trotskyite type plan. Radek, unlike the others that were tried, was not executed. Instead he was given a ten-year sentence but he apparently did not survive it.¹⁵⁰ Wright's attempts to get Radek to the U.S. and Radek's own previous contacts with the Council on Foreign Relations were probably not helpful to him. Stalin and other communists of the time, such as R. Palme Dutt, were convinced that socialist movements outside the Soviet Union had been corrupted and were working for international banking interests.¹⁵¹ Carroll Quigley makes a similar statement in his book *Tragedy and Hope*. He notes

that Wall Street powers and the organizations that they controlled, such as the Council on Foreign Relations and the Institute on Pacific Relations, had frequently worked with the communists and at times even financed their operations in order to achieve their own ends.¹⁵² In 1988 the Soviet Unions Supreme Court overturned Karl Radeks conviction. The following year however, when Mikhail Gorbachev was visiting the Council on Foreign Relations and was shown some of the material that Radek had sent to them he simply stated, "he was a traitor".¹⁵³ This is an interesting statement considering that it came from the man that presided over the fall of communism and the breakup of the Soviet Union.

In addition to cooking the history books, planning the takeover of the Institute of Pacific Relations and, apparently, trying to help Radek get out of the Soviet Union, Wright was also helping Shotwell and Clark Eichelberger who were still trying to involve the U.S. in the League of Nations. This came in the form of getting the U.S. to sign on to various treaties and agreements that were international in nature such as the Kellogg-Briand Pact. Their main effort however, was to get the U.S. to join the World Court which would have effectively served as a back door to world government. The court, however, went down to defeat in 1935 with its supporters blaming three individuals for

its demise: Father Charles E. Coughlin, William Randolph Hearst and Huey Long.¹⁵⁴

By the late 1930's it was becoming apparent to everyone that there was a possibility of another war in Europe. Supporters of world government, however, simply viewed this as another opportunity to implement their ideas. The planning stages for this began early in January 1939, nine months before the onset of actual war in Europe.¹⁵⁵ Realizing that the League of Nations was now dead they set out to build a new international organization. The League of Nations Association was to play an important part in this new effort but under a new name. In a letter to Edward C. Carter of the Institute of Pacific Relations Quincy Wright stated:

I think sentiment toward the League of Nations as such is at a very low ebb in this country. The general opinion is that it is dead, beyond revival, that again I think can be clearly indicated by the tactics of the League of Nations Association which has practically abandoned activities under that name, though the officers are continuing work in the Commission to Study the Organization of Peace and the Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies.¹⁵⁶

Wright went on to note that: "In regard to the League of Nations I think a great many feel that any future organization of the world would necessarily make use of the experience and much of the machinery of Geneva, but so far as general public opinion is concerned I think any plan for world organization

should emphasize that what it proposes is something new and not merely the rehabilitation of the League."¹⁵⁷

The two organizations that Wright mentioned in his letter to Carter, the Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies and the Commission to Study the Organization of Peace both came into being in the Fall of 1939 shortly after the outbreak of World War II. Clark Eichelberger, a key player in both organizations remarked that: "As time went on, it seemed more and more remarkable that pretty much the same group of leaders, in the same office, with the same staff, and supported primarily by the same national organizations, should undertake planning for the future and for giving maximum support to the allies as the war grew more intense."¹⁵⁸

The Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies

As with most of these committees, commissions and organizations The Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies began life under a different name. Originally called the Non-Partisan Committee for Peace Through Revision of the Neutrality Law, its purpose was to counter the efforts of Father Coughlin who was one of the leaders of those opposing world government and U.S. involvement in another European war. William Allen White, editor and publisher of the *Emporia Gazette* in Kansas, was selected as chairman of this committee with James T. Shotwell having the final say so on all who were

to serve on the committee. In accepting the chairmanship, White, who must have been a little naïve, insisted that: "We must have no money from international bankers or from munitions makers which includes big and little steel."¹⁵⁹ The official announcement of the formation of the committee came on 20 May 1939 and less than six months later on 27 October 1939, the U.S. Senate repealed the Neutrality Law. White, thinking that his mission was complete, was preparing to close up shop. Eichelberger, however, and some of the other members of the League of Nations Association, had other ideas.¹⁶⁰

William Allen White was a respected member of the Midwest press, an area the country where isolationism got its strongest support, and therefore an asset that the League of Nations Association would not want to lose. Following the repeal of the Neutrality Law, Eichelberger, remained in close contact with White. Six months later, in April 1940, they asked White to reactivate his committee—this time as the Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies.¹⁶¹ White agreed and he immediately began cheerleading efforts on behalf of Roosevelt's plan to trade U.S. destroyers for British military bases in the Caribbean, his lend-lease proposal and other schemes to aid the Allies cause.¹⁶²

Things progressed smoothly throughout the summer and fall of 1940. In late December, however, while giving a statement to Roy Howard of the Scripps-Howard news service, White once again showed his lack of understanding concerning the people that he was dealing with and their ultimate goals. In responding to a question concerning the committees' position on whether or not America should actually enter the war, White said: "The only reason in God's world I am in this organization is to keep this country out of war."¹⁶³ He then went to say: "I have no doubt that some members of our organization who are not officially representing us are martial-minded. To condemn all of us for our more belligerent brethren is as foolish and unfair as it would be to call the Knights of Columbus appeasers because Joe Kennedy gave Roosevelt the Judas kiss."¹⁶⁴ Eichelberger and the other committee members were furious. When they called for a retraction--White refused--the committee then demanded his resignation, which he gave on 01 January 1941. This, however, created another problem for them. The reason that the committee was held in such high esteem was due almost entirely to William Allen White's reputation as a man of integrity with both the public and the media. In order to avoid the public relations nightmare that would ensue if White were to be publicly sacked he was named honorary chairman of the Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies. It continued operating until

after America's entry into World War II when it then merged with other organizations supporting the war effort.¹⁶⁵

The Commission to Study the Organization of Peace

The Commission to Study the Organization of Peace was much smaller than the Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies having about 60 members whereas the Committee to Defend America had hundreds.¹⁶⁶ It was, however, destined to have a much greater impact on world affairs than its sister organization. The commission was to play a major role in the formation of the soon-to-be created United Nations. In the introduction to its' *"Building Peace: Reports of the Commission to Study the Organization of Peace 1939 to 1972"* commission chairman, Louis B. Sohn stated:

It might not have been a mere coincidence that when the Conference to establish the United Nations took place in San Francisco in 1945, forty-seven members of the Commission were there as members of the International Secretariat, members of the United States Delegation, or consultants to the United States Delegation. The Chairman of the Commission presided at the meetings of the consultants, and the Director of the Commission chaired a committee of consultants representing various national organizations which were especially interested in problems of human rights and dependent peoples. It is not surprising, therefore, that when one compares the Commission's report with the final text of the Charter of United Nations, one can find a remarkable resemblance between a number of the Commission's proposals and the text of the Charter, especially with respect to maintenance of international security (e.g., international air-force contingents), trusteeship (including the special problem of strategic areas), human rights, and economic and social cooperation.¹⁶⁷

Though their views have never been shared by a majority of the American people, they have tried with unlimited funds to set themselves up as the sole guardians of peace.

The key players in this group were James T. Shotwell, Quincy Wright, Clark Eichelberger, and Clyde Eagleton. Shotwell was the chairman of the commission, Eichelberger its director. Eagleton chaired the commission's studies committee, and Wright supervised the section that explored the creation of a political international organization.¹⁶⁸ Other prominent individuals on the commission included: John W. Davis 1924 Democratic Party presidential candidate and attorney for J.P. Morgan¹⁶⁹, the Dulles brothers—John Foster and Allen Welsh-- of the law firm of Sullivan and Cromwell a Morgan law firm, Frederick Vanderbilt Field, Thomas W. Lamont of J.P. Morgan and his son, Corliss, who was the founder of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship¹⁷⁰, and Under-Secretary of State Sumner Welles. In 1940, historian Harry Elmer Barnes described the commission and its members as follows: "These names stand for the League of Nations and collective security. They are to be found on the interlocking directorates of the numerous committees and associations mothered by Nicholas Murray Butler and his Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. Though their views have never been shared by a majority of the American people, they have tried with unlimited funds to set themselves up as the sole guardians of peace."¹⁷¹

The Commission to Study the Organization of Peace was set up to serve as a sort of unofficial Enquiry similar to the one that James T. Shotwell participated in during and after World War I. Its main goal was to plan the organization of international society following war. Although the commission's work was not officially sanctioned, it did operate with the blessings of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt. Commission member Clark Eichelberger was the contact man with the White House. He met with Roosevelt on at least 10 occasions, giving him copies of commission reports and updating him on their activities. According to commission records Eleanor Roosevelt eventually became a member of the organization.

People, however, were not going to be told that the solution to the problems of world peace was the creation of a world government until they had been properly prepared.

In addition to its work designing a new world order, the commission was also to serve as a sort of information agency on world affairs for the general public. The statement announcing the creation of the organization said that, "One of the purposes of the Enquiry is to help the American people think their way through the problems of the fundamental bases of world peace and the responsibility of the United States."¹⁷² People, however, were not going to be told that the solution to the problems of world peace was the creation of a

world government until they had been properly prepared.¹⁷³ In order to achieve this, commission member planned to spend a six to twelve-month period organizing a report that would then be presented to the public.¹⁷⁴ The Columbia Broadcasting System (CBS), one of the commission's main supporters, agreed not only to broadcast periodic statements by the commission but it also agreed to broadcast the entire proceedings of its final report--a planned two-day event—over its Columbia network.¹⁷⁵ The National Broadcasting Company (NBC) also aired Commission programs.¹⁷⁶ Following the broadcast they planned to begin a new drive to create world government--this time with the United States participating. The reason they were so optimistic about their chances for success was that, although war had been declared in Europe, it was the period of the "sitzkrieg" or phony war and many believed that a fighting war could still be avoided. Eichelberger wrote:

Speculating about the future of the League machinery, we reasoned that the world might go to the brink of war and then pull back. Should that happen, there would be a movement to revise the League Covenant; more than that, a movement to reorganize the League itself. American public opinion might be frightened out of its isolationism and be willing this time to fulfill the obligations of full membership.¹⁷⁷

In May of 1940 sitzkrieg turned to blitzkrieg and by June France had fallen and Great Britain had been kicked off the continent of Europe. Always planning ahead, the commission decided that in the event that a shooting war

did develop, it would be used as an excuse to create a new world body to replace the League of Nations.¹⁷⁸

Planning for the creation of an entirely new world organization could not be done in the 6 to 12-month period that the commission originally allocated for this work. Since, however, the world would be at war for the foreseeable future this did not seem to be a problem. They simply used their preliminary report to serve as an outline and continued the project.

By early November 1941, work had progressed far enough that in an interview with, United Press Associations reporter, William Lovell that would be considered forward-looking even today, Quincy Wright described what he referred to as the "New World Order".¹⁷⁹ Lovell wrote that, "Dr. Quincy Wright of the University of Chicago predicts that if Hitler is defeated, the Nazi chiefs projected 'new order' will be replaced by a world organization patterned in many respects after the League of Nations--but immeasurably strengthened by American participation and the use of the British and United States navies to enforce its edicts."¹⁸⁰

The global system that Wright described was to be a federation made up of three branches, a legislative branch, an administrative branch, and a world court.¹⁸¹ Membership in this world organization was to be open to all states and those that did not accept this offer would be subject to certain

disadvantages.¹⁸² The new global system was also going to have powers never dreamt of by the League of Nations. Commission member Clyde Eagleton noted that, "This organization should have some power to lay down rules, binding upon all members, without requirement of unanimity, and without permitting a state to legally reject it."¹⁸³ He then went on to list nine areas in which the world government should have control. Among them: communications, health care, social services, raw materials, markets, money and exchange, barriers to trade, armaments, and the ability to prevent war.¹⁸⁴

Individual Nations would not necessarily have any voice in the new government.

The idea of using the British and American navies as a means of preventing war was quickly expanded to include Russia and China and rather than using naval power to keep the peace it was decided that air power alone would be sufficient in most cases.¹⁸⁵ The use of national military forces was only a temporary solution to the problem. Eventually national forces were to be reduced drastically or completely eliminated with international military forces taking their place.¹⁸⁶ Commission reports in early 1940's state:

After its initiation, the force should be recruited by volunteering. Sufficient volunteers to provide the necessary air men and ground men ready to swear allegiance to the world organization could undoubtedly be found from among the world's two billion people. It has never been

difficult for governments to enlist men in foreign legions, as Lyautey's force in Morocco, and the Abraham Lincoln Brigade in the Spanish Civil War. There are always many men whose love of adventure or idealistic interest will draw them into such a career. Such men have motivations which make it easy for them to be loyal to the international authority irrespective of national origin. There should, however, be regulations such as distribution of men of several nationalities even in the smaller units to assure that such recruits would retain their loyalty to the world order.¹⁸⁷

The question of who would be represented in this new world government was not as straightforward as one might think. Individual Nations would not necessarily have any voice in the new government. Some commission members argued exactly this point while others like Quincy Wright were more liberal on the subject. Wright said that, "Although I believe that Nations should also be given a representation and perhaps functional international organizations, my conception of an assembly would be that every important group with a distinctive opinion ought to have some representation whether that group is national, regional or universal."¹⁸⁸ Individuals were to have no voice in the new democracy.

Individuals were to have no voice in the new democracy.

In addition to the global system, Wright outlined a continental or regional system. There would be three main regional systems, a United States of Europe (also referred to as a European Union), a Pan-American union

consisting of North and South America, and an Asian system. The Soviet Union, while it would be a member of the global system, was not to be part of any of the continental systems.¹⁸⁹ The idea of creating a regional system in addition to the global system was not new. The League of Nations had been exploring a similar idea.¹⁹⁰ In the Commission's Preliminary Report is stated that, "Whatever the outcome of the present war, it is unlikely that there will again be twenty-seven independent national sovereignties in Europe, each having the right to make war, to surround itself with tariff walls, and to maintain a different currency."¹⁹¹ The regional systems were also to be permitted their own military force.

In the United Press interview Wright also discussed the issue of national sovereignty. Lovell wrote that, "Sovereignty and independence of individual nations will be retained, subject to limitations necessary to operation of the continental and world systems, Wright predicted." In the commissions Preliminary Report it is stated that, "A sovereign state, at the present time, claims the power to judge its own controversies, to enforce its own conception of its rights, to increase its armaments without limit, to treat its own nationals as it sees fit, and to regulate its economic life without regard to the effect of such regulations upon its neighbors." It then goes on to say that, "These attributes of sovereignty must be limited."¹⁹² This however, is somewhat of an

understatement of the commission's real feeling on the issue of national sovereignty. In a letter to Shotwell, Wright noted that, "Our general thought was that we must recognize the inadequacy of the sovereign state as it has been under the present conditions of economic and cultural interdependence and that consequently the world faces the alternatives of empire a' la Hitler or world federation, which is the only method compatible with democracy."¹⁹³ Wright further clarified this point in a letter to *The Daily Maroon*, the student newspaper at the University of Chicago, in which he wrote, "In order to establish permanent peace in the world it is necessary to stop the clustering of all political loyalties around the same symbols." He then went on to explain, "My point was that excessive loyalties to certain sacred cows, such as sovereignty, nationality, neutrality, and domestic jurisdiction is ruining civilization."¹⁹⁴

"...excessive loyalties to certain sacred cows, such as sovereignty, nationality, neutrality, and domestic jurisdiction is ruining civilization."

Transition Period

From the beginning, the new world government, unlike its predecessor, the League of Nations, was planned to be a sovereign global federation from the beginning. Implementation of such a grand scheme would require an

enormous amount of time and effort. Realizing this, the Commission planned for a transitional period during which the political and economic mechanisms for such a system could be put in place. The Commission's second report *The Transitional Period*, released in February of 1942 addressed this subject. In it, it is stated:

It is impossible to say how long a period will or should elapse between the cessation of hostilities and the establishment of a permanent world order. It is clear, however, that the traditional methods of ending a war--armistice, conference, and treaty--are inadequate, and should be abandoned. A period of control, between war and peace, is now essential, so that it will not be necessary to rush decisions; so that there may be a time for careful thought, for experimenting and testing, for the rebuilding of national governments, the formation of public opinion, the discovery of what peoples want, after their sufferings, in the way of a permanent settlement. Time for study and deliberation is essential in the democratic process, and for the solution of vast problems. It is not necessary to estimate in advance the time required for this process, but it is essential to establish the community means of control for the period.¹⁹⁵

...economic integration would precede political integration.

One of the main obstacles to U.S. participation in the League of Nations was the U.S. Senate's objection to American involvement in a world political organization that would clearly limit its rights as a sovereign nation. Having learned from their previous mistake, it was decided that this time, economic integration would precede political integration. As early as April 1940 Shotwell wrote to Wright stating:

I have an idea that has been materializing recently, which I would like to put up to you. It is that we make our report correspond somewhat with the structure of the organization we envisage in a revised League. That would mean that we treat the economic and social problems in a semi-autonomous way so as to give a whole picture of possibilities and functional development to those who will not accept a political league. It may be that the future lies along that path.¹⁹⁶

The new world economic order was to be based upon three financial institutions—the International Monetary Fund, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and the International Trade Organization.

The new world economic order was to be based upon three financial institutions—the International Monetary Fund, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and the International Trade Organization.¹⁹⁷ Economic integration at the regional level was also being planned. Former U.S. ambassador to Spain, Richard N. Gardner, wrote that, "The Marshall Plan was conditioned on the dismantling of intra-European trade barriers and other concrete measures toward European economic unity. It thus led directly to the establishment of the Organization for European Economic Cooperation and paved the way for the creation of the European Common Market and eventually the European Union."¹⁹⁸

"In the permanent order to be established, absence or withdrawal will be impossible." These reports also made it very clear who was going to pay the lion's share of this global reconstruction project—the American people.

Political and military control of the world during the transition period was to be in the hands of the four great powers that they thought would make the largest contributions to the war effort—Britain, China, Russia, and the United States.¹⁹⁹ It was also planned that during the transition period membership in the world organization was to be expanded to include neutral countries and the defeated Axis powers. Prior to being allowed into the new world order, however, the Axis powers would have to undergo a period of extended military occupation during which the people in these countries were to be psychologically prepared for participation in it. When this goal was achieved the military occupation was to end and national and international governments were to take their place.²⁰⁰ Commission reports also note that, "In the permanent order to be established, absention or withdrawal will be impossible."²⁰¹ These reports also made it very clear who was going to pay the lion's share of this global reconstruction project—the American people.²⁰²

The League of Nations Gets a New Name

In late December 1941 a new term, the "United Nations", began to creep in to the lexicon of globalization. According to, playwright and adviser to President Roosevelt, Robert E. Sherwood, the term was coined by Roosevelt himself on 29 December 1941²⁰³ and was first used publicly on 01 January 1942 in a document called the Declaration by the United Nations.²⁰⁴ This Declaration had four main signatories the United States, United Kingdom,

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and China. In addition to these four powers, 22 other countries signed at this time.²⁰⁵ The main body of the declaration dealt entirely with the defeat of "Hitlerism". In its pre-amble, however, it mentioned the Atlantic Charter. This reference is significant because while there is no mention of a future world organization in the Declaration by the United Nations there is a suggestion of such a body in the Atlantic Charter.²⁰⁶ Regardless of what was stated in the document Wright, Eichelberger, Shotwell and the rest knew exactly what the President meant. Eichelberger wrote:

At the time of the adoption of the Joint Declaration by the United Nations in January 1, 1942, there had been some who criticized the fact that the Declaration said nothing about the form a future world organization should take. However, it had seemed clear to us that President Roosevelt was then simply not yet ready to spell out a structure that might be rejected by an insufficiently prepared public.²⁰⁷

According to Wallace the Founding Fathers were in error when they based our government on what he called "political or Bill of Rights" democracy. He stated that, "Carried to its extreme form, it leads to rugged individualism, exploitation, impractical emphasis on states' rights, and even anarchy."

The first U.S. government official to openly speak about the United Nations and the roll it would play following the war was Vice President Henry A. Wallace. Wallace, an outspoken socialist and great admirer of the Soviet way of life, believed that the anniversary of the Bolshevik Revolution in Russia was as important a milestone in mankind's fight for freedom as was the Fourth

of July.²⁰⁸ On 08 November 1942, as U.S. troops were landing in North Africa to fight for the first time in the European war as part of "Operation Torch", Wallace was addressing the Congress of American-Soviet Friendship at Madison Square Garden in New York City. In the speech, Wallace outlined plans for creating a "new democracy of common man".²⁰⁹ The "new democracy of common man" that Wallace spoke of bore a striking resemblance to democracy as defined by Mary Parker Follett. According to Wallace the Founding Fathers were in error when they based our government on what he called "political or Bill of Rights" democracy. He stated that, "Carried to its extreme form, it leads to rugged individualism, exploitation, impractical emphasis on states' rights, and even anarchy."²¹⁰

Wallace felt it necessary to discard traditional American democracy because it could not guarantee world peace. He stated:

"This new democracy will be neither communism of the old-fashioned internationalist type nor democracy of the old-fashioned isolationist sort. Willingness to support world organization to maintain world peace by justice implemented by force is fundamental to the democracy of the common man in these days of airplanes. Fortunately, the airplanes, which make it necessary to organize the world for peace, also furnish the means of maintaining peace. When this war comes to an end, the United Nations will have such an overwhelming superiority in air power that we shall be able speedily to enforce any mandate whenever the United Nations may have arrived at a judgment based on international law."²¹¹

Further noting the shortfalls of American political democracy, the Vice President went on to advocate the creation of several new types democracy then being practiced in the Soviet Union:²¹²

- Economic democracy
- Ethnic democracy, which meant "that the different races and minority groups must be given equality of economic opportunity."
- Educational democracy was to be based upon Ethnic Democracy
- Democracy between the sexes. This could be achieved only by ignoring the obvious differences between men and women. He was particularly interested in putting women into combat roles in the military.

Roosevelt, apparently, was interested in more than just being an organizer of the planned new world government--he also harbored a desire to be its first President.

On 13 November 1942, five days after Wallace gave his speech at Madison Square Garden, Clark Eichelberger again met with President Roosevelt. According to Eichelberger, Roosevelt immediately turned the topic of conversation to the United Nations and his plans for the future. He said that, Roosevelt felt that the only way for the world government to be successful would be for it to be dictatorial in nature. By this he meant that the U.N., using the strength of its four main members, the United States, Great Britain, the Soviet Union and China, was going to have to force its will upon the remaining nations the world. Although when the U.N. was finally formed, France was among the five permanent members of the Security Council, its

initial exclusion was intentional. Roosevelt did not think much of France--or Frenchman in general for that matter--and twice at this meeting made statements that were critical of them.²¹³

Roosevelt, apparently, was interested in more than just being an organizer of the planned new world government--he also harbored a desire to be its first President. As their meeting was coming to close, Eichelberger made reference to the possibility of him serving as President of United Nations of the World. At first F.D.R. said that he would be too old for such a job and that he planned to retire to Hyde Park to raise Christmas trees but Eichelberger, pursuing the point a bit further, noted that, "His mood suddenly changed. He said something like, well, perhaps for two years."²¹⁴

The Red Menace

The Congress of American-Soviet Friendship originally began life, in the 1920s, as the Friends of the Soviet Union.²¹⁵ Correspondence between Corliss Lamont, the organizations chairman, and Quincy Wright suggests that it underwent several name changes over the years--the American Council on Soviet Relations and the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship among them.²¹⁶ Early on there was nothing remarkable about the membership of this group with the possible exception of Corliss Lamont who was the son of Thomas W. Lamont, senior partner at J.P. Morgan but by 1942 this had

changed. Its membership rolls now included some of the most well known names in government, business, academia, and the entertainment fields among them:

Cordell Hull-Secretary of State	Joseph E. Davies-Ambassador
Harold L. Ickes-Secretary of Interior	Jesse Jones-Secretary of Commerce Breckinbridge
Long-State Department	Edward Stettinius- Special Assistant to FDR
Paul McNutt-Defense Health Welfare	Thurmon W. Arnold- Asst. Attorney General
Albert Einstein-Princeton Univ.	Oscar L. Chapan- Interior Dept.
Thomas Mann-Princeton Univ.	Charles Chaplin-Actor
Eugene O'Neill-Playwrite	Frederic March-Actor
Paul Robeson-Actor	Edward G. Robinson-Actor

The list also included seven members of the United States Senate and one member of the House of Representatives.²¹⁷ In addition to these notable individuals, the League of Nations Association, Commission to Study the Organization of Peace, Harris Foundation and Institute of Pacific Relations were all well represented in the organization continuing the tradition of the interlocking groups. Among the representatives of these groups were: Dr. Frank Aydelotte, Edward C. Carter, William Allen White, Samuel N. Harper, Thomas W. Lamont, William Allen Neilson, and James T. Shotwell.²¹⁸ Quincy

Wright served on the initiating committee of the Chicago branch of this organization.²¹⁹

Edward C. Carter belonged to several of these type organizations. In addition to the Congress of American-Soviet friendship he also was a director of The American Russian Institute and president of Russian Relief.²⁰⁰ It was, however, his role as Secretary General of the Institute of Pacific Relations and that organizations position on communism in postwar China that would propel him into the national limelight. Although China, on paper at least, was always considered by Roosevelt to be one of the big four powers that was to rule the world following war, the reality was much different. On the surface it appeared to be united in its opposition to Japanese aggression but China was further divided by two internal factions as opposed to each other as they were the Japanese, the Kuomintang under Chiang Kai-shek in southern China and the Communists under Mao Tse-tung in northern China. By September 1944, Roosevelt, fearing that Chiang was more interested in preventing further Communist expansion into southern China than he was in opposing the Japanese, demanded that command of all Chinese forces be turned over to U.S. general Joseph Stilwell. Roosevelt could not have made a worse choice. Stilwell who had been operating in China since early 1942 had nothing but contempt for Chiang, his army, and its officer cadre. Chiang for as part had

little use for Stilwell and in late September he demanded his removal from China. On 18 October Roosevelt relented and announced that Stilwell would be recalled.²²¹ This incident fueled the suspicions of Chiang Kai-shek and his supporters in both China and the United States. Many began to openly question which side America was really supporting—the Kuomintang or the Communists.

One such individual was Alfred Kohlberg an importer of Chinese textiles and also a long-standing member of the Institute of Pacific Relations. On 09 November 1944 Kohlberg sent a letter to Edward Carter demanding an explanation for certain publications that the Institute had distributed that he felt were critical of Chiang's government and favorable to the Communists. According to Kohlberg, one such publication stated that, "They (the American, British and Soviet governments) have, however, limited their economic and military assistance because of fear that any supplies they send might be used in civil strife rather than against the Japanese."²²² This was written at a time when Roosevelt was claiming that all available aid was being given to China. In his letter, Kohlberg stated:

After reading the above referred-to booklet, I decided to look into the IPR publications further. Of course, I have received them all the years, but have seldom had time (I thought) to read them. As a result of this reading, I now attach hereto a lot of clippings from your publications, along with clippings from "The Communist" (official organ of the

Communist Party in the U.S.A.) and "New Masses" (another Communist organ), also a few other clippings that seem to bear on the same issues. If you will go through these, I think you'll find that your employees have been putting over on you a not-too-well-camouflaged Communist line. Your staff publications follow the "New Masses" line exactly but not quite so frankly and the "New Masses" articles are much better documented.²²³

At this point, Kohlberg, made no mention of the fact that one of Carter's key staff members, Frederick Vanderbilt Field, also happened to be on the editorial boards of the *New Masses* and its sister publication, the *Daily Worker*, both Communist Party journals.²²⁴

This was not Kohlberg's first run-in with Carter. Three or four years earlier he threatened to resign from the Institute because he thought Carter had too many Communists on his staff. After Carter assured him that these people were hired based solely upon their work product and not for political reasons, Kohlberg withdrew his resignation. In 1943, he again approached Carter to complain about the Communist influence in the IPR but again nothing was done.²²⁵

By December 1944 the China problem was becoming critical. In order to help defuse the situation, Stephen Duggan, wrote to Quincy Wright requesting him to sign a letter inviting Dr. Chang Po-ling, one of China's "foremost" educators, to visit the United States "...in the hope and belief that misunderstandings may be removed and cordial relations

reestablished."²²⁶ According to Duggan this was being done at the request "...of non-political Chinese who have nothing to do with the political division within China."²²⁷ The letter was to be signed by representatives from eight organizations, the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace and Rockefeller Foundation among them. Wright was being requested to sign as president of the American Association University Professors.²²⁸ The China incident was the beginning of what would eventually become known as the "McCarthy Era".

As the situation in China was beginning to unravel, Roosevelt was making plans to unveil his blueprint for world government to the American people and the world at-large. A conference to draft the United Nations Charter was to be held in San Francisco beginning on 25 April 1945. This conference was intentionally planned to take place before the war ended. The reason for this was that FDR knew that once the war was over, opposition to his plan would quickly materialize.²²⁹ The conference took place as scheduled, lasting from 25 April 1945 to 26 June 1945, but Roosevelt did not live to see it.

One of the first things that investigators noticed was that these organizations all seemed to have, at the very least, an extreme left and in many cases, what appeared to be, an outright Communist point view.

The opposition Roosevelt feared began to appear almost immediately and the organizations that helped plan the world government quickly became the objects of very close examination. One of the first things that investigators noticed was that these organizations all seemed to have, at the very least, an extreme left and in many cases, what appeared to be, an outright communist point view. In June and July of 1946 the *Chicago Journal of Commerce* ran a series of articles by Andrew Avery called "The Communist Fifth Column".²³⁰ In the series, Avery examined numerous organizations and individuals that seemed to advocate the agenda of the radical left, among these was the Institute of Pacific Relations and its secretary-general, Edward C. Carter. Avery, apparently, had also been tactless enough to let the cat out of the bag concerning Frederick V. Field and his ties to Communist Party publications. Carter, immediately realizing the seriousness of the situation, wrote to an IPR trustee in Chicago, Louise Wright, to see if she or her husband, Quincy, could intervene, in some manner, with the editor of the *Chicago Journal of Commerce* on his behalf. Carter, blaming Kohlberg for the story, assured her that, "It so happens that I do not know of a single Communist in our 2000, but there may be a few. Certainly our board would be reluctant to exclude from membership a person solely on the ground that he was Communist Party number."²³¹

A week later, on 25 July 1946, Carter sent a second, more desperate note to Louise Wright. In this letter Carter admitted that some small portions of Avery's article may be true such as the fact that IPR staff member, Frederick V. Field, also was on the staff of both the *New Masses* and the *Daily Worker*, New York's two most prominent Communist publications.²³² In an attempt to defend Field and the Institute, Carter claimed that while, "It is true that Frederick Field used to be Secretary of the American Council and that he is now a member of the Board of Trustees. None of his writings for the IPR have ever expressed a leftist point view. His work in the Institute has been most objective."²³³ Carter then discussed his own involvement with what appeared to be Communist organizations. In 1944 he was photographed at the International Workers Order headquarters. In explaining his presence there he stated that, "With reference to my connection with the IWO, it is true that as President of Russian Relief I was photographed two years ago at the IWO headquarters receiving in token a gift of some millions of good American cigarettes for the Russian Army. As you know, we repeatedly announced to the public that we would take gifts for Russia for any source."²³⁴ Carter neglected to mention his association with two other groups, the American Russian Institute²³⁵ and the Congress of American Soviet Friendship.²³⁶ His failure to mention these last two organizations was probably not as large an oversight as it may appear seeing as Louise Wrights' husband, Quincy, was

also, to some extent, involved with these organizations. It is interesting to note that in his second letter Carter was then claiming that Avery had gotten his information from the House Un-American Activities Committee as opposed to Kohlberg.²³⁷

Louise Wright's first move was to contact, Walter Fisher, an attorney with the prominent Chicago law firm of Bell, Boyd & Marshall. Her choice of Fisher is an interesting one. There are two possible ways in which she could have approached him. The first and most obvious was that she was acquainted with him through the Chicago Council on Foreign Relations of which he was president²³⁸ and she a director.²³⁹ The second possibility is that she approached him through the wife of the law firms senior partner Laird Bell. Mrs. Bell and the Wrights would have been acquainted through the Chicago Council of American-Soviet Friendship of which Mrs. Bell was a sponsor.²⁴⁰ In any case she forwarded Carters second letter and the Avery article to Fisher and asked him for advice.

Fisher wrote back saying that he did not know if everything in the article was accurate but that, "What is said about the National Lawyers Guild and the Chicago Civil Liberties Committee is entirely consistent with my direct knowledge of those organizations."²⁴¹ He also noted that while Carter was

accusing Avery of getting his information from the House Un-American Activities Committee, Avery, in fact, had ridiculed the committee stating:

...hardly anyone has done as much to help the communists as Dies did with his wrong-headed and biased investigating committee. Dies exposed many a Communist, but then he nullified the exposure by unfair charges against many non-Communists... To a lesser degree, the same high service for the Communist Fifth Column is now being performed by the present House Committee on Un-American Activities. Its chairman is John S. Wood of Georgia but it's best known—and worst known—member is the incredible John E. Rankin of Mississippi.²⁴²

Fisher's response, at first glance, would seem to indicate a complete lack of understanding, on his part, of what he was involved in. It must be remembered however, that the socialist philosophy that most of these people believed in was not based upon the classless society of Marx and very few took their orders from Moscow. The Eastern Establishment and the organizations that it spawned, the Council on Foreign Relations, the Institute of Pacific Relations, the League of Nations Association and all their various sub-groups were simply using the communists²⁴³ to achieve their own vision of world government. When the heat came on, as it did in the years following World War II, they simply through the communists to the wolves.²⁴⁴

Wright and Carter knew that any hint that an organization had a communist political philosophy would immediately result in its funds drying up.

Quincy Wright did not like this solution—and with good reason. Certain of these organizations maintained very high-profiles, with thousands of prominent members, many of whom had, like Kohlberg, never questioned the goals of the group. The Institute of Pacific Relations was one such organization. Wright and Carter knew that any hint that an organization had a communist political philosophy would immediately result in its funds drying up. In his first letter to Louise Wright, Carter told her that Paul Hoffman, the President of Studebaker, and its Board of Directors was already expressing their concern about the situation due to the financial support they had given the IPR.

Fisher, in his letter to Louise Wright, had also mentioned that the *Chicago Journal of Commerce* intended to reprint Avery's articles in booklet form.²⁴⁵ At this point Quincy Wright intervened, personally contacting the editor in an attempt to prevent further distribution of the article.²⁴⁶ Then things began to calm down a bit—at least as far as the Institute of Pacific Relations was concerned. The reason for this may have been that another publication, also located in Chicago, with a much wider circulation than that of the *Chicago Journal of Commerce*, had just printed an even more sensational series of articles.

On 06 August 1946 as Quincy and Louise Wright were preparing their defense of Carter and the Institute of Pacific Relations, the *Chicago Daily Tribune* began running a two-part series of articles, by Willard Edwards, about an organization called "Americans United for World Government". In the piece, Edwards stated that several organizations were pooling their efforts in order to further the cause of world government. He also claimed that Edward R. Stettinius Jr. organized this drive, while actively serving as Secretary of State, in order to gain support among the American people for the United Nations.²⁴⁷ Among the groups that Edwards identified as being part of this umbrella organization were the Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies, the United Nations Association (formerly called the League of Nations Association), and a group called Citizens for Victory.²⁴⁸

One of the basic functions of this organization was to serve as a political action group that would actively attempt to defeat candidates that were opposed to world government.

The World State that this new organization was advocating was to consist of an executive body, a legislature, a judicial branch (with jurisdiction over the individual), and a world army. This military force was to be "... so recruited and so based that no individual, group, or nation could seize control of it."²⁴⁹ It was also noted that, "Upon the achievement of world government,

all national armaments save limited quantities for internal policing should be abolished, and the manufacturer of armaments, save those required by a world army and for internal policing, should be banned."²⁵⁰

One of the basic functions of this organization was to serve as a political action group that would actively attempt to defeat candidates that were opposed to world government. In this endeavor they were somewhat successful. Among their victims were Senators Wheeler from Montana, Shipstead of Minnesota and Nye from North Dakota.²⁵¹ Fear was the weapon of choice for this group. In commenting on this point, Edwards stated that, "The political campaign for a 'world government' uses the dread phrase 'atomic war' as its propaganda weapon."²⁵² He continued on saying that, "Since its inception two years ago, this group has inspired the publication of hundreds of magazine and newspaper articles and scores of books which hammer upon the theme that the atom bomb has made national governments obsolete. This propaganda frankly seeks to terrify."²⁵³

Supporters of this group included some of the richest men in America including Chicago merchant Marshall Field III, James P. Warburg of the Bank of Manhattan²⁵⁴ and Owen D. Young chairman of the board of General Electric.²⁵⁵ In addition to these wealthy individuals were some of Hollywood's elite, among them: Spyros Skouras, president of 20th-Century Fox Film Corp.,

Darryl F. Zanuck, vice president of 20th Century Fox, producer Walter Wanger and actor Douglas Fairbanks.²⁵⁶ Also among this group were numerous members of the Commission to Study the Organization of Peace who happened to serve as directors.

The presence of such a large number of commission members on the Board of Directors of Americans United, would, at first glance, seem to be quite a coincidence. Clark Eichelberger, however, has explained this strange occurrence. First, according to him, once America had entered the war, the Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies, the League of Nations Association and the Commission to Study the Organization of Peace were merged together in an umbrella organization called Citizens for Victory.²⁵⁷ Then while discussing his final meeting with Roosevelt, on 11 October 1944, he commented that: "No matter how pressed he was, he had time to think of our organizations and how we were getting along financially. I explained that for tax reasons we had kept two organizations. The political action work was being undertaken by Americans United for World Organization, which had been recently created for that particular purpose, and the educational work by the League of Nations Association and the Commission, which now of course would use the United Nations name."²⁵⁸

Eichelberger's use of the term World Organization Instead of World Government in the groups name may not simply reflect a loss of memory. By the late 1970s, when he was writing about his experiences, the term "world government" had fallen, distinctly, out of favor with the American people and so he may have just been being "diplomatic" in his choice of words.

"At present U.N. officials are concentrating on teaching American children democracy as the first step toward making them enthusiastic supporters of the new order."

Following directly on the heels of the Edwards revelations came a second *Tribune* story, this one on U.N. efforts to change what children would be taught in school. In the 1920s when William Hale Thompson first revealed that children were being indoctrinated in their classrooms on the benefits of globalization, the *Tribune* said nothing. Now, however, it also began to object to this kind of activity. In the article, "*U.N. 'New Order' Propaganda To Begin At Cradle*", written by Walter Trohan, it is stated that, "At present U.N. officials are concentrating on teaching American children democracy as the first step toward making them enthusiastic supporters of the new order. While the same program of education is to be used in several other countries, it has not been asked for by Russia."²⁵⁹ This is probably because, as vice president Henry Wallace noted in his speech at Madison Square Garden, that is where the

program came from. He then detailed how special books were being prepared for use in the schools and that publications were being prepared for adults as well.²⁶⁰ As part of this program children were to learn about a new set of heroes—international heroes—who were responsible for creating the U.N. Among these heroic figures were:

Franklin Delano Roosevelt	Winston Churchill
Joseph Stalin	Sumner Welles
V.M. Molotov	Eleanor Roosevelt
Cordell Hull	Edward R. Stettinius Jr.

The U.N. educational program that Trohan was referring to was approved at the first UNESCO General Conference held in November and December of 1946.²⁶¹ One of the first things on its agenda was the creation of "A Study of Education for International Understanding in the primary and secondary schools and in institutions of higher learning of Member States, to be conducted by the Member States with the assistance of the UNESCO Secretariat."²⁶² In order to comply with this resolution each nation would be required to conduct a study of how textbooks treated the subject of international agencies since 1918.²⁶³

In July of the following year, Leonard S. Kenworthy of UNESCO's Education Section contacted Wright and asked him to review and comment on

its work to date. He also asked for suggestions on how to improve it. Wright then outlined a five-point program that far exceeded anything that had been proposed before. Among his recommendations were:²⁶⁴

- The expansion of the history textbook program to include English, geography and civics courses at all levels of education including the elementary grades. Wright noted that the National Education Association was already preparing a guide for this kind of activity.
- A more concentrated effort should be made on college campuses regarding the United Nations and the study of international relations. He noted that certain groups and individuals had been active in this area since before World War I.
- A study of mass media of communications. Wright stated that, "The press, the radio, and, to a lesser degree, the movie, have dealt extensively with the United Nations."
- A study of documentary material available to teachers in United States.
- A study of organizations devoted to adult education in the international field.

In this country very careful attention should be given to the content of the educational courses and adult education dealing with the United Nations.

Wright identified several organizations as having been instrumental in the educational program, some of them having been active in the project since before World War I. Among these groups were the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, the Commission to Study the Organization of Peace, the American Association for the United Nations, the New York Council on Foreign Affairs and the Chicago Council on Foreign Affairs (Wright was probably referring to the New York and Chicago branches of the Council on

Foreign Relations). He also singled out several individuals as having been key members of this project one of whom was Professor Charles E. Merriam of the University of Chicago.²⁶⁵ Wright finished up his report by stating, "It seems to me that the problems of both teacher-training and general education concerning the United Nations in the United States are ones of quality, rather than quantity. In this country very careful attention should be given to the content of the educational courses and adult education dealing with the United Nations. A proper combination of realism and idealism, of factual information and general principles, is essential."²⁶⁶

Since the United States would now have to evaluate its entire educational system to ensure compliance with the UNESCO directive, the Department of State created The United States National Commission for UNESCO. Its chairman was Milton S. Eisenhower and some of its more prominent members included Edward R. Murrow, Archibald MacLeish and Quincy Wright's wife, Louise.²⁶⁷ One of the earliest attempts to improve American international education standards, associated with this group, was the Fulbright Act, which allocated more than \$140 million in scholarship money for exchange students.²⁶⁸ This effort was somewhat similar to the Rhodes scholarship fund set up by Cecil Rhodes earlier in the 20th century—only this time with the American people footing the bill.

As the year 1947 dawned, Carter and Wright were still battling to silence Kohlberg whose work was now beginning to be taken seriously. In February, Carter wrote a letter addressed to several people, including Quincy Wright and Arthur H. Dean of the New York law firm of Sullivan and Cromwell, discussing the possibility of stopping Kohlberg through the courts. Carter wrote that, "As you will remember, some of our friends have urged us to institute libel proceedings against Kohlberg. But invariably the consensus of our consultants has been that though we might conceivably win a favorable judgment, such action would give Kohlberg a field day for damaging publicity which a certain section of the press would peddle enthusiastically to the American public."²⁶⁹ The reason the Carter was becoming optimistic about this approach was that he had heard about a case, recently filed in Chicago against the *Chicago Herald American*, concerning a story about Communist activity in the United States.²⁷⁰ Carter noted that, Judge Evan A. Evans, "Backed by Judge Otto Kerner ...held that it is libelous per se to call a man or corporation a Communist or sympathizer. This would mean that the persons so labeled would not have to prove he had suffered actual damage. He would have to show only that he had been called a Communist."²⁷¹ This would be the ideal weapon to silence the opposition... of course this strategy would depend upon the ability of a jury to sympathetically understand the subtle differences between their philosophy and that of Communism.

At this point however, were really beginning to get out of hand. In addition to Kohlberg, the *Chicago Journal of Commerce* and the *Chicago Daily Tribune*, the United States Chamber of Commerce now entered the picture. The Chamber of Commerce issued 572,000 copies of a report by its Committee on Socialism and Communism entitled "*Communist Infiltration in the United States - Its Nature and How to Combat It*". On page 39 of that publication was a bibliography that listed the *Chicago Journal of Commerce* article.²⁷² This changed the dynamics of the entire situation. It was one thing to try and use the courts to silence one individual like Kohlberg, but something completely different to go after an organization like the Chamber of Commerce. Realizing this, Carter suggested that they contact members of the Chamber that he thought would be sympathetic to their cause and ask them to put a stop to the investigations. Among those that he suggested were William A. Patterson of United Airlines, Earl O. Shreve of General Electric and Clarence Francis of General Foods.²⁷³

Since 1944, Kohlberg, had been requesting an internal investigation by the Institute into its own activities. Apparently, the heat generated by the various news stories was sufficient to get the leadership of the IPR to agree to put Kohlberg's proposal to a vote. A special meeting for the purpose of creating such a committee was scheduled for the afternoon of 22 April

1947.²⁷⁴ The meeting was presided over by Arthur H. Dean, who was also the National Vice-Chairman of the Institute. Nate White, a reporter for *The Christian Science Monitor* was present and reported on the proceedings. "The Council's case was stated by Mr. Dean, who described himself as a man 'pilloried' almost daily in the Communist Party's *Daily Worker* and the British Communist press as an American anti-Communist. He said he would be happy at any time to investigate documented evidence of Communist influence in the Institute, and that any person who was found guilty of such bias would be swiftly dealt with."²⁷⁵ The only thing, however, that Dean "swiftly dealt with" at this meeting was Kohlberg's proposal. After hearing from several Institute officers, Philip C. Jessup, among them and after having read numerous letters of support from prominent individuals, one of which was from former Under-Secretary of State, Sumner Welles, a vote was taken. Kohlberg's resolution was defeated 1,163 to 66—and of those ballots cast, 1,097 were proxies.²⁷⁶ It is unclear as to whether or not Kohlberg was aware that proxies were to be used at this gathering. What is clear, however, is that the rank and file membership of the Institute of Pacific Relations wanted no part of any investigations—internal or otherwise—into the organizations activities.

Immediately following the meeting Carter prepared a letter to all institute members proclaiming their victory over Kohlberg.²⁷⁷ In the letter Carter stated, "We regard this as a mandate to carry on an even more vigorous program of research, education and conferences on the Pacific Area. You may be assured in the future, of materials of the same high standard of accuracy that has characterized IPR publications for the past 20 years."²⁷⁸ Carter's victory announcement was somewhat premature as others were now beginning to take an interest in the Institute's activities.

By March of 1946 the Civil War between the nationalist forces of Chang Kai-shek and the Communist forces of Mao Tse-tung, which had been delayed by the Japanese invasion of China, had broken out in earnest. At first, the Truman administration, which relied heavily on the advice of so-called "Far Eastern Experts", extended to Chang and his followers some financial aid but did little else to help his cause.²⁷⁹ Then in March of 1949, fifty members of the U.S. Senate co-sponsored a bill that would have given Chang an additional \$1.5 billion but the State Department blocked it. By the end of the year Chang and his forces were driven from mainland China²⁸⁰ and many in the United States, including prominent members of the U.S. House and Senate, felt that extremists in the State Department deliberately allowed this to happen. As a

result of this, more official investigations into socialist and Communist infiltration of the U.S. government were begun.

On Lincoln's birthday in 1950, Sen. Joseph McCarthy made an anti-Communist speech at Wheeling, West Virginia charging that there were Communists in the employ of the U.S. Government, the State Department in particular. About a week later he repeated the charge in the U.S. Senate, once again emphasizing the involvement of the State Department. A few weeks after this he again repeated the charge, this time in front of a subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, chaired by Sen. Millard Tydings of Maryland.²⁸¹ At this time, Sen. Joseph McCarthy specifically named Owen Lattimore, Esther Brunauer, Frederick L. Schuman and Philip C. Jessup (all of whom were either members of the Institute of Pacific Relations, the Commission to Study the Organization of Peace or both) as being key players in turning China over to the Communists. In its official report, however, the Tydings Committee decided that McCarthy was guilty of committing a fraud and a hoax.²⁸²

In early 1951, another U.S. Senate Sub-Committee began an investigation into subversive activity in the State Department. This particular subcommittee soon centered its attention on the Institute of Pacific Relations whose records it had recently subpoenaed. Initially IPR officers referred to this

investigating body as the "Senate Judiciary Sub-Committee on Un-American Activities" but the Senate Internal Security Sub-Committee chaired by Sen. Pat McCarran of Nevada would actually conduct the anticipated investigation.

On 09 February 1951, William L. Holland, who had replaced Edward C. Carter as Secretary-General of the IPR, in an effort to blunt the effects of the investigation, gave a statement to the press concerning the recent seizure of IPR records by the Sub-Committee.²⁸³ Five days later Holland wrote a letter to all trustees and members of the Institute. Along with this letter he included information related to the seized records and requested members to turn over these documents to local radio and newspaper editors. He stated that the reason that he wanted them to leak this information to press was to prevent the Senate Sub-Committee from holding a trial by headlines or by running a smear campaign. Following this he accused McCarthy of having been the one responsible for previously leaking some of the seized documents to the press. Holland declared:

It is already clear that isolated passages from old IPR correspondence, taken out of context, are being shown to favored newspaper reporters and that an attempt is being made to create the impression that the IPR has exerted a sinister influence on the U.S. State Department. Much of this campaign appears to be an attempt to revive charges made last year by Sen. McCarthy (who is a member of the present Senate Judiciary Sub-Committee) against Ambassador Philip C. Jessup and Mr. Owen Lattimore.²⁸⁴

It should be noted that while IPR officials singled out McCarthy as the bad guy throughout this period he does not appear to have had any official tie to McCarrans' subcommittee.

On 16 February 1951, Holland released a second statement to the press, this time announcing that Sen. McCarthy had nothing to do with the tip that led to the seizure of IPR records from Edward C. Carter, at his home in Lee, Massachusetts. Apparently, in the summer of 1949, Carter had removed significant portions of IPR records from the organizations New York office and transferred them to his home for safekeeping. Claiming that the FBI was already aware of these records and had been given access to them the previous year, Holland said that, "The papers consist largely of the normal correspondence of Mr. Carter..."²⁸⁵ He also mentioned that there were probably records relating to another organization that Carter had been president of... Russian Relief.²⁸⁶ Holland finished up the statement by quoting from a telegram that he sent to Sen. McCarran accusing him and his subcommittee of illegally seizing IPR records and then demanding that there be no further leakage to press from them.²⁸⁷

On 20 February 1951, Sen. Homer Ferguson a member of the Senate subcommittee, who apparently had also received a telegram from Holland, sent his reply. Ferguson denied that the records were illegally seized and

further stated that the committee was not responsible for any leaks of information. Gerard Swope, Chairman of the American IPR, then responded to Ferguson. Swope cited an article from the *Daily News* in New York, filed on 12 February, claiming that segments of the seized files were made available to the paper as proof that the subcommittee was leaking information to press. He then stated that senators Mundt and McCarthy had, prior to the subcommittee's seizure of the records, already gained illegal access to them.²⁸⁸ McCarthy, as far as I can tell, has never been accused of running a band of second-story men. This being the case, it probably means that somebody from within the IPR itself was responsible for giving the documents to the Senator and since the seized records came from Carter's home, that someone must have been very close to him. Swope then demanded that the committee publicly disassociate themselves from McCarthy.²⁸⁹ He finished up the letter by telling Ferguson that the papers in Carter's possession were of little importance and that the committee should instead concentrate its efforts on documents that he would provide.²⁹⁰

On 23 February, Holland sent one more letter to the subcommittee, this time to Sen. Karl Mundt. In it he, once again, denied all allegations that the IPR exerted a powerful influence in the State Department.²⁹¹

On this point Holland may have been correct. It was the people that financed and formed the interlocking directorates of these organizations that wielded the power and influence that McCarthy spoke of, not the organization itself.

The McCarran subcommittee was not as kind to the IPR and its members as was Tydings and his subcommittee. According to Fulton Lewis of the *Chicago Herald-American*, "The IPR was torn to shreds by the McCarran subcommittee, winding up with the label that it did little more than serve as a shield for the destruction of Free China."²⁹² The investigation and its aftermath also brought Quincy Wright into the limelight. While naming individuals involved with the organization, Lewis noted:

Another is Quincy Wright, contributor to Common Cause magazine, official publication of the Committee to Frame a World Constitution. Wright doesn't like senators McCarthy and McCarran. Neither does Lattimore. Wright was a secretary at one time to the central committee of the World Citizens Association. This outfit stands for such things as the following, taken from plank 5 of its platform:

- National states must be subordinate to world civilization
- their jurisdiction must be limited to world law, and any local
- any local legislation contrary to world law must be null and void.

Wright is also listed in House Committee and on Un-American Activities files as one of a long list of sponsors who sent a message to Congress in 1943 demanding the committee be abolished.²⁹³

In 1953 Congress set up a Special Committee to Investigate Tax-Exempt Foundations with Rep. B. Carroll Reece, of Tennessee in the chair.²⁹⁴ According to Carroll Quigley, this committee "...following backward to their source the threads which led from admitted Communists like Whitaker Chambers, through Alger Hiss, and the Carnegie Endowment to Thomas Lamont and the Morgan Bank, fell into the whole complicated network of the interlocking tax-exempt foundations."²⁹⁵ He then noted that, men of great wealth let it be known that they would be unhappy if the investigation were to go to far. In the following year (1954) the committee issued a report showing the left wing connections of the foundations and their ties to government but there was little media interest in it.²⁹⁶

Sen. Joseph McCarthy was, apparently, not as accommodating to the wishes of those in positions of power and wealth as Congressman Reece and many others. By continuing his investigations into left wing activity in the U.S. government he incurred their wrath. The beginning of the end for McCarthy came in late February 1954. Sensing that something was wrong, Willard Edwards of the *Chicago Tribune* warned him to ease up. McCarthy ignored the warning and shortly thereafter found himself being rebuked by prominent Republicans such as President Dwight D. Eisenhower and Sen. Ralph Flanders of Vermont.²⁹⁷ His real downfall, however, came when CBS and

Edward R. Murrow targeted him on their program *See It Now*. Murrow was not the independent television journalist that some, today, believe him to have been. For years he been associated with the Institute of International Education at one point even serving on its Board of Trustees. Along with Murrow were 17 other trustees. Among them:²⁹⁸

Stephen P. Duggan	William A. Neilson
John Foster Dulles	Virginia Gildersleeve
Thomas W. Lamont	Mary E. Woolley
Harry J. Carmen	Alvin Johnson
Paul Monroe	Leland Rex Robinson

The downfall of Joseph McCarthy brought to an end not only his investigations into Communist and Socialist involvement in the U.S. government but it also effectively ended all other investigation into this type of activity.

Coincidentally each of these individuals was also involved with either the Institute of Pacific Relations or the Commission to Study the Organization of Peace or both.²⁹⁹ The attack on McCarthy by CBS and Murrow was so successful that it encouraged others to do the same. Within a short period everything McCarthy said was called a lie and he, as an individual, was simply portrayed by the media as evil.³⁰⁰ The downfall of Joseph McCarthy brought to an end not only his investigations into communist and socialist involvement in the U.S. government but it also effectively ended all other investigation into this type of activity.

[The National Education Association] was to instruct educators in proper methods of teaching children about the benefits of world government.

The investigations of the late 1940s and early 1950s had little or no real effect on these organizations and their plans for world government. Although the Institute of Pacific Relations did cease to exist as a result of them, others such as the Commission to Study the Organization of Peace, which produced eight full reports and 20 smaller ones between 1940 and 1953, continued to thrive throughout the period. In 1954, which some consider the peak year of the investigations; the National Education Association finally published the guide that Wright mentioned in his letter to Kenworthy. The purpose of the book was to instruct educators in proper methods of teaching children about the benefits of world government. It had specific chapters dealing with each level of education--elementary school, high school, the first two years of college and one on how to develop world-minded teachers. They considered the issue of altering the history books so important that two chapters of it are dedicated entirely to that subject.³⁰¹ The fact that this type of activity continued, uninterrupted for the most part, throughout the period of investigation seems to indicate that Carroll Quigley was correct when he suggested that the congressional Hawk Shaw's dropped the ball when told do so—all except, perhaps McCarthy.

The Rise of World Government

In spite of the efforts of global government opponents, the world that Quincy Wright outlined in the United Press interview in late 1941 began to take shape exactly as he predicted. As stated there would be a world body and three main continental systems: Europe, the Americas and Asia.

The U.S. Congress, acting in total disregard of the will of the American people, who were overwhelmingly opposed to it, ratified the WTO agreement.

Although the United Nations, a political entity, was formed prior to the end of World War II the sovereign powers necessary for it to function as a world government were not granted to it. This was in accordance with Shotwell's suggestion that economic integration should precede political integration. As noted previously, there were to be three global financial institutions that would serve as the foundation of this "new world economic order". The first two, the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development were formed as a result of the Bretton Woods conference in 1944. The third, the International Trade Organization (ITO), which was to succeed the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), never materialized because the U.S. Congress, once again sensing an encroachment on U.S. sovereignty, refused to ratify it. In order to get around this setback, the GATT was used to achieve the ITO's goals for the next fifty years.³⁰² On 15 April 1994 the GATT ceased to exist and on 01 January 1995 the World Trade Organization (WTO) took its place. This time, however, the U.S. Congress, acting in total disregard of the will of the American people, who were overwhelmingly opposed to it, ratified the agreement. The WTO, which negotiates and implements trade agreements, operates out of Geneva Switzerland. It consists of a ministerial conference, a general council and a director-general—none of whom are elected by or are in any way answerable to the people. This is a classic example of "democracy" as defined by Mary Parker Follett.

The Continental Systems

Europe was the first of the three continental systems to form. The reason for this was simple. Following the war, Europe was a financial basket case and it was demanded, as part of the terms of the Marshall plan, that an Organization for European Economic Cooperation that be formed.³⁰³ The next step in European economic and political integration was the announcement, in 1950, of the creation of the European Coal and Steel Community.

Although these organizations were, as Shotwell suggested, economic in nature, there was never any doubt as to their real purpose. According to Ambassador Cynthia P. Schneider:

The U.S. has always understood that the European project was primarily political, not economic. Its founder said so. In the Schuman declaration of May 9, 1950, which announced the European Coal and Steel Community, French Foreign Minister Robert Schuman said: "the pooling of coal and steel production should immediately provide for the setting up of common foundations for economic development as a first step in the federation of Europe." Konrad Adenauer, addressing the Bundestag, said that: "...the parliaments of the six European countries which will have to deal with this European Coal and Steel Community realize exactly what it is all about and that in particular they realize that the political goal, the political meaning of the European Coal and Steel Community, is infinitely larger than its economic purpose."³⁰⁴

Several countries, feeling that this was too radical a change, decided instead form the European Free Trade Association (EFTA).

The fear of this new judicial system was in no way reduced by a recent ruling of the European Court of Justice that the European Commission "could restrict dissent in order to 'protect the rights of others' and punish individuals who 'damaged the institution's image and reputation'."

The next step in creating a unified Europe came in 1958 with the creation of the European Economic Community, which extended the common market for coal and Steel to all other economic areas. There would be little change in the fledgling European super-state, with the exception of the creation of a European Parliament in 1979, for the next 27 years. In reinventing government parlance, the period 1945 through 1984 would be considered the European Unions "slow trigger" phase. Then in 1985, with the announcement of a plan to create a single market by 1992, it entered into its final or "fast bullet" stage.³⁰⁵ Two years later the power of the European Parliament was expanded under the Single European act and two years after this, in 1989, plans were announced for Economic and Monetary Union. In 1991 the Treaty on European Union was unveiled and the following year it was signed in

Maastricht and sent to the European states for ratification. The single market took effect on 01 January 1993 and the following year the EU and EFTA joined to create a European Economic Area.³⁰⁶ European Monetary Union was next on the agenda and that took effect on 01 January 1999. A regional criminal court system, the prosecutor of which, has the authority to order a national judge to issue an arrest warrant, valid in any EU country, is also being implemented. This authority upset some in Britain because it is based on an inquisitorial model rather than the traditional British trial by jury.³⁰⁷ The fear of this new judicial system was in no way reduced by a recent ruling of the European Court of Justice that the European Commission "could restrict dissent in order to 'protect the rights of others' and punish individuals who 'damaged the institution's image and reputation'."³⁰⁸ Author Ambrose Evans-Pritchard, writing for the *Electronic Telegraph*, notes that this is the same legal theory used by fascist governments in the 1920's and 1930's to silence their critics.³⁰⁹

The creation of a European Super-State is almost a reality; only a military force, necessary to enforce its will upon the national governments of Europe, is lacking. The drive to make this force a reality began in late November 1998 when German foreign minister, Joschka Fischer stated that; "Just as we worked together on the first real transfer of sovereignty in the field of currencies, we ought to work on a common constitution to turn the European Union into an entity under international law."³¹⁰ Then, when asked if he supported a European army, Fischer said, "If it is going to turn into a full union, then one day foreign and defense policy will also have to become community tasks."³¹¹

Proponents of a unified Europe have long denied that their goal was to create a super-state that would strip nations of their sovereign powers. In May 1999, while British Prime Minister, Tony Blair, was in Aachen, Germany to receive the Charlemagne Prize for his efforts on behalf of a united Europe, he was, at the same time, dismissing calls

for a European army. Blair stated that, "No one I know wants some overblown United States of Europe."³¹² Eighteen months later Blair found it again necessary to deny that there was any intent to create a European super-state after it was announced that Britain would be contributing 12,500 troops to a new European defense force.³¹³

Proponents of a unified Europe have long denied that their goal was to create a super-state that would strip nations of their sovereign powers.

The Americas was the second of Wright's Continental systems to begin formation. While Europe was carefully prepared for the creation of its super-state, little was done in the Western Hemisphere along these lines. This was particularly true in United States. There were several reasons for this. Europe had been host to two major wars in the first half the 20th-century and as a result the people could easily be intimidated by the possibility of a third. The Western Hemisphere, on the other hand has been relatively peaceful. Europeans also had the added incentive of being on the receiving end of the Marshall Plan, along with its requirement of a united Europe, while Americans (U.S. taxpayers) were only allowed to participate in the great give-away by paying for it. To put it quite simply, there was no crisis in the Americas that could be used to the push the economic and political integration of the hemisphere forward. Although the current drive towards hemispheric union began with the creation of the Organization of American States in 1948, it was not until the late 1980s that things really began to move in this direction.

Once again, following the Shotwell model, economic union would precede political union. This began with the Canadian-U.S. Free Trade Agreement in 1988 which was quickly, expanded by George Bush, into the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA). Although Bush originally signed the agreement in December 1992, it was Bill Clinton that pushed it through Congress in 1993—against the overwhelming opposition of the American people.

NAFTA took effect on 01 January 1994 and in December that same year, at the Summit of the Americas was held in Miami. Plans were immediately made to expand NAFTA into the Free Trade Area of the Americas (FTAA) by January 2005. In October of 1997, Bill Clinton made clear the goal of these free trade agreements when he declared that a great tide of change was sweeping the globe and that "...isolationist voices must be ignored as efforts proceed to fully integrate the political and economic future of the Americas."³¹⁴ Eight months later the U.S. State Department echoed this call when it announced its "...intention to continue deepening political and economic integration in our hemisphere from Tierra Del Fuego to the Canadian Arctic."³¹⁵

The Americas, like its European counterpart, will also have its own military force. In January 1995, Col. Michael Dziedzic of the U.S. Air Force wrote an article, "NAFTA and North American Security", which was published by the National Defense University.³¹⁶ In the article Dziedzic noted that NAFTA "... is nevertheless replete with implications for regional security cooperation."³¹⁷ He then went on to describe a regional military force whose main opponent would be civilian rather than military. Its primary mission, according to Dziedzic, would involve illegal immigration, contraband weapons and illegal drugs.³¹⁸ Col. Dziedzic then said, "Thus, any trilateral mechanism created to deal with security on the North American continent would ineluctably confront issues that are fundamentally domestic in nature, such as appropriate responses to rebellion in southern Mexico or to the separatist movement in Quebec."³¹⁹

In July of that same year former Secretary of Defense, William J. Perry, convened the first Defense Ministerial of the Americas. A Defense Department press release stated that, "The Ministerial provides the Secretary an opportunity to get to know his counterparts in the Western Hemisphere better and to initiate a dialogue on defense

and security issues. The Ministerial is being held in the spirit of the Miami Summit and complements the process of hemispheric integration begun there."³²⁰

In 1998, Col. Max Manwaring (USA Ret.), in an article for the National Defense University, further clarified the mission of the new international military force when he claimed that International Terrorism and Organized Crime (ITOC) was now the greatest threat facing the democracies of the Western Hemisphere. He then said that; "Despite the obvious differences between the organizations, tactics, motives, and objectives of the various elements that constitute international terrorism and organized crime (ITOC), all have one thing in common—they are engaged in what the Organization of American States (OAS) has recently defined as 'grave common crime'."³²¹ Manwaring, realizing that individual nations could not defend themselves against so formidable an opponent, called for "... a coordinated and cooperative application of all national civilian and military resources in full harmony with those of a variety of international and functional organizations."³²² He then stated that, "Because success against ITOC requires close unilateral and multilateral coordination and cooperation for an effective unity of effort, the only viable approach to the transnational threat to hemispheric stability and security is to devolve the responsibility to the OAS."

On 17 January 2001, Deputy Secretary of Defense Rudy de Leon presided over the activation of the Western Hemisphere Institute for Security Cooperation at Fort Benning, Georgia. The purpose of this Institute, according to de Leon, is to prepare soldiers and "defense civilians" for the 21st century. Echoing Manwaring, de Leon said, "As we enter this new century, we find that nations are increasingly addressing these transnational problems with multinational solutions. No nation can afford to face these challenges alone. The United States has relied on cooperation with partners and allies to protect our global security interests. Over the past decade we have turned many times to hemisphere cooperation to safeguard our mutual interests."

Clearly military preparations for what Wright referred to as the Pan-American union have not advanced as far as their European counterpart but progress is being made in this direction.³²³

In all probability it will be as Menom suggested, a "dollarization" of the hemisphere, that will create monetary union as opposed to an entirely new currency as was the case in Europe.

The creation of a regional monetary system of the Americas began in 1998 with a modest proposal by Argentina's President to create a single currency for the Mercosur countries.³²⁴ A similar idea was floated for NAFTA countries. However, Canadian Ambassador to the U.S., Raymond Chretien indicated that while the Canadian government was open to the concept, the general consensus was that, "In Canada and Mexico, any politicians who promoted monetary union would be taking a risk because of widespread unease about U.S. domination."³²⁵ In January 1999, crisis intervened in the form of a Brazilian currency devaluation and the following day Argentine President, Carlos Menem, leapt into action calling for a common hemispheric currency, based on the U.S. dollar, as part of the Free Trade Area of the Americas.³²⁶ In all probability it will be as Menom suggested, a "dollarization" of the hemisphere, that will create monetary union as opposed to an entirely new currency as was the case in Europe.

The Asian system has not progressed as far as either the European or American systems. One of the reasons for this is that while European integration is being led by Germany and the integration of the Americas is being led by the United States government, albeit against the wishes of its people, Asia has no such leader—not that anyone trusts anyway. The logical leader of this region, from the point of view of the two western continental blocs, Europe and the Americas, would be Japan. The Japanese, however, are still a little gun shy from their last experiment in regional politics, the East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere, which blew up in their faces when atomic bombs

were dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. This leaves only the People's Republic of China as a potential leader of an Asian system and that would be unacceptable to not only the western powers but to many in Asia also.³²⁷ Further complicating matters in Asia is the fact that countries still consider the sovereign rights of nations to be the single most important factor in international affairs.³²⁸ While this attitude remains, political integration of the area will remain impossible.

Economic integration, on the other hand, is making some progress through the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), which organized the ASEAN Free Trade Area (AFTA). The Asian Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) is another organization formed to facilitate free trade in the Pacific Rim, however, the powers to enforce their decisions on sovereign nations does not exist. True economic integration, like political integration in Asia, will remain a fiction as long as countries are free to pursue their own economic and political self-interest.

Reinventing the Nation-State

At the national level, there are four areas that have been particularly fertile ground for reinventers: redefining the concept of national sovereignty, reinterpreting national constitutions, redefining the role of the armed forces in society and re-educating the people to accept these radical changes.

In order for international government to succeed, national government must first undergo radical change. John Gardner, planning director for Metropolitan Toronto, suggests that forces in the world today are simultaneously pushing power up to the international level and down to the local level.³²⁹ The process in which power is stripped away from national government and then reassigned to the local or international level is commonly referred to as devolution. At the national level, there are four areas that have been particularly fertile ground for reinventers:

redefining the concept of national sovereignty, reinterpreting national constitutions, redefining the role of the armed forces in society and re-educating the people to accept these radical changes.

The concept that a nation is sovereign and has the right to govern itself within its own borders dates back to 1648 and the Treaty of Westphalia. R.C. Longworth, who writes about globalization for the *Chicago Tribune* commented that; "The idea of sovereignty has echoed down the three and a half centuries since then and is the basis both of self-government and of international relations."³³⁰ This concept was first officially called into question when—as bombs began falling on Baghdad during the Gulf War—President George Bush proclaimed:

This is an historic moment. We have in this past year made great progress in ending the long era of conflict and cold war. We have before us the opportunity to forge for ourselves and for future generations a new world order—a world where the rule of law, not the law of the jungle, governs the conduct of nations. When we are successful—and we will be—we have a real chance at this new world order, an order in which a credible United Nations can use its peacekeeping role to fulfill the promise and vision of the U.N.'s founders.³³¹

The truth of the matter is that Bush was a little premature in his announcement. The reason for the initial attack on Iraq was that Saddam Hussein had invaded Kuwait, violating its sovereignty. This opened the door for retaliation.³³² "The new rules appeared, probably for the first time, after the war when the UN Security Council passed Resolution 688. This authorized the UN to go into Iraq, against the Iraqi government's will, because of events—the threats to Kurds—taking place within the country."³³³ The NATO attacks upon Serbia in the spring of 1999 are another example of national sovereignty being swept aside by proponents of world government. Prime Minister Tony Blair of the U.K., in his Doctrine of International Community, states that there are five considerations that international bodies must take into account before bombing or invading a sovereign nation:

- "Are we sure of our case?"
- "Have we exhausted all diplomatic options?"

- "Are there military operations we can sensibly and prudently undertake?"
- "Are we prepared for the long term?"
- "Do we have national interests involved?"³³⁴

If one accepts Blair's criteria for determining whether or not a nation should be bombed or invaded by global military forces, then one would also have to accept, as justified, the military aggression of every warlike nation and military coalition in history—including the Axis powers during World War II.

Like the regional and world forces, they too are preparing for major operations against civilian populations.

National armed services are being reengineered in order to be able to properly interact with global and regional military forces while at the same time working with state and local governments. Like the regional and world forces, they too are preparing for major operations against civilian populations. This new type of mission is referred to as Operations Other Than War (OOTW). *Military & Aerospace Electronics*, an armed forces trade journal, describes the OOTW mission as follows: "OOTW includes disaster relief, counter drug operations with large crowds of civilians, language barriers, decentralized small units and political pressure to minimize collateral damage and casualties."³³⁵ When early news reports of the military's new mission began to appear in the press in the early summer of 1994, it was strongly suggested that these troops were for use in third world nations and other uncivilized areas, not the United States.³³⁶ By December 1994, however, this had changed. The West '95 "Operations Other Than War" conference openly discussed how these forces could be used in the U.S.³³⁷ In August of that year troops from fourteen nations began to assemble for training at the Joint Readiness Training Center at Fort Polk in Louisiana.³³⁸ Two months later, in October, Russian troops began to arrive for training in the U.S. as part of the Peacekeeper '95 exercises.³³⁹ While these early exercises took place in rural areas, as the original news reports

suggested, by 1998 multi-national forces were training for warfare in major urban centers, such as Chicago, under the code name "Urban Warrior".³⁴⁰

Using military force within the United States is a sensitive subject because under the Posse Comitatus Statute it is illegal; but the Defense Department is moving ahead anyway.

Using military force within the United States is a sensitive subject because under the Posse Comitatus Statute it is illegal; but the Defense Department is moving ahead anyway:

"The Pentagon plans by midsummer [1999] to have a plan for how the U.S. military would support local authorities in the event of a large scale attack. But the Defense Department is nervous about taking on this new mission for several reasons. The Pentagon is aware that some Americans have 'apprehensions' about having the U.S. military operate domestically, John Hamre, the deputy secretary of defense, told reporters. It's important to do this in a way that isn't frightening to people, he added, emphasizing that the military would not get involved in law enforcement."³⁴¹

A presidential commission has recommended that the Defense Department and other government agencies be put in charge of security in several private sector areas including: "banking and financial services, telecommunications, electric power, oil and gas delivery, transportation, water, emergency services and government services."

This statement, however, put Hamre directly at odds with, then Vice President, Gore's effort to create a National Law Enforcement / Public Safety Network. In *Reengineering Through Information Technology*, it is specifically stated that defense units would be used in addition to national guard units for all kinds of public safety emergencies.³⁴² Furthermore, a presidential commission has recommended that the Defense Department and other government agencies be put in charge of security in several private sector areas including: "banking and financial services, telecommunications, electric power, oil and gas delivery, transportation, water, emergency services and government services."³⁴³ In commenting on the need to monitor private civilian communications in order to protect

these vital areas, U.S. Air Force Major General Michael Hayden stated, "We can't get a step-and-a-half out of the box without trampling on someone's civil liberties."[344](#)

The U.S. Constitution with its system of checks and balances and the concept of individual rights, enshrined in its Bill of Rights, makes it an impossible document for the supporters of global government to deal with.

Tony Blair, while speaking in Chicago on 22 April 1999, mentioned that national constitutions were also to be targets of the reinventing process.[345](#) Nowhere is that more true than here in the United States. The U.S. Constitution with its system of checks and balances and the concept of individual rights, enshrined in its Bill of Rights, make it an impossible document for the supporters of global government to deal with.

In 1907, future Chief Supreme Court Justice, Louis Brandeis stated that; "We are under a Constitution, but the Constitution is what the judges say it is...".[346](#) Today, many in the federal court system accept the Brandeis theory that the law is what they say it is and no longer consider the Constitution as a whole or its Bill of Rights as an "authoritative part" of the law of the land. The courts have made a habit of intervening in all kinds of debate that properly belongs in the legislative arena and making radical change. *The Wall Street Journal* noted in an editorial that, "We are looking at a Constitution invented by a gaggle of lawyers and activist judges who litigated what they couldn't legislate."[347](#) Supreme Court Justice Antonin Scalia recently stated that, "The court must be living in another world. Day by day, case by case, it is busy designing a Constitution for a country I do not recognize."[348](#)

Reinventing the basic law of the land is no longer the sole preserve of the federal judiciary. Today government officials routinely ignore the limitations placed on their authority by the Constitution. President Clinton has used the executive order to usurp congressional authority so effectively that it prompted presidential advisor Paul

Begala to comment, "Stroke of the pen. Law of the land. Kinda Cool."[349](#) House Majority Leader, Dick Armey

responded to this saying:

"Kinda Cool, Mr. Begala? With a stroke of the pen, President Clinton undermined the foundations of federalism. With a stroke of the pen, he repudiated a time honored, fundamental principle that rules this nation. By a stroke of the pen he gave a green light to future unwarranted and unconstitutional national regulatory powers and actions. With a stroke of the pen, he may have done irreparable harm to individual rights and liberties."[350](#)

Minor government officials are also doing their part to reinvent the Constitution. Rudolph Giuliani, mayor of New York City, is using the city's administrative code to override the Constitution's prohibition against unreasonable search and seizure.[351](#) The city of New Orleans, with the help and finances of a group of prominent attorneys, is organizing other municipalities in an attempt to neutralize the second amendment.[352](#)

Constitutional law professor, Eugene Volokh, at UCLA, has suggested that the issue of whether we are governed by the Constitution or as Louis Brandeis stated, by the dictates of the Supreme Court, may be coming to a head. According to Professor Volokh, there is currently a case involving the Second Amendment that is winding its way through the court system that will leave the Supreme Court with two options. Either they must affirm the Constitution as the law of the land or disavow it and substitute their personal preferences in its place.[353](#) If they choose the later of these two positions they may find that they have quite a bit of competition in deciding just what is the new law of the land.

Education, an area that had traditionally been considered a local issue, has now become part of the national agenda. This is particularly true when it comes to the study of history. The last decade of the 20th-century ushered in what historian, Gary B. Nash, refers to as "The History Wars of the 1990s" and it bares a striking resemblance to the campaign that William Hale Thompson waged against Wright and the textbook revisionists of the 1920s.[354](#) Whereas

Thompson was battling to preserve U.S. history and American culture from the revisionists, in the 1990's the study of Western civilization and Western culture in general was added the agenda. This modern group of textbook editors has two weapons in their arsenal that their predecessors lacked. The first is the U.S. Department of Education, created in 1980 and the second is the National Education Standards Improvement Council, which was established in 1994. With these in hand an attempt was made to create not only national standards for U.S. history but national standards for world history as well.

The national standards for U.S. history decreed that people like Paul Revere, Albert Einstein, Thomas Edison and the Wright Brothers were to disappear altogether from history textbooks while others like Ulysses S. Grant would be mentioned but once. These standards also call for the amplification of people and events that would be considered negative in our nations past. Historic occasions, like the first gathering of the U.S. Congress, also disappear with the founding of politically correct institutions like the Sierra Club and the National Organization for Women replacing them.³⁵⁵ The new national standards for world history, at the insistence of the American Historical Association, were to be equally inclusive and decidedly non-Western in nature.

Opposition to this, most recent, attempt to radically change the history books ran into a firestorm of opposition. Once again, as in the 1920s, it was individuals that led the opposition—individuals like Lynne V. Cheney and William Bennett—and once again a powerful newspaper, *The Wall Street Journal*, took up their cause.

The outcome of this current round of textbook alteration has not yet been determined. As recently as February of 2000 *UNESCO SOURCES* magazine advocated the removal of Napoleon from the history books on the grounds that he does not inspire peace. It is also stated, in this particular issue, that; "History needs to be revised so

as to inspire understanding and recognition between peoples instead of war and division. Seeing our past as a series of dates, battles and warriors distorts it, masking the history of peoples that most of us have yet to learn."[356](#)

Reinventing Local Government

The main goal of these local reengineering projects is to institute what is called "sustainable development."

Some of the most radical government reengineering is occurring at the local level. Over the past ten years, numerous summits and conferences, sponsored by various United Nations agencies, have been held to outline plans for local government in the twenty-first century. These plans cover such things as housing, health care, population control, land use, transportation and almost any other aspect of life that can be imagined.[357](#) Realizing that governing the world from the top down would be a difficult—if not impossible task—proponents of world government decided, instead, to approach it from the bottom up. In order to accomplish this, the world's major cities are being reorganized into what some call "citistates"[358](#) and others refer to as "region-states."[359](#) In an article for *The Wall Street Journal*, "New World Order: The Rise of the Region-State", Kenichi Ohmae wrote that, "These region-states may in fact stretch across national borders: Hong Kong and southern China, for instance, or San Diego and Tijuana, or the 'growth triangle' of Singapore, neighboring sections of Malaysia and nearby Indonesian islands."[360](#) Neal Pierce, of *Governing* magazine, observed that; "In an ironic way, we may be reverting to a world order similar to the flourishing economy of 14th and 15th century Europe, when 80 member cities of the Hanseatic League created a vibrant network of intercity alliances that hosted trading guilds and their ambitious merchants."[361](#)

The main goal of these local reengineering projects is to institute what is called "sustainable development."

The origins of this idea can be traced to the Earth Summit held in Rio de Janeiro in 1992. This concept was further

developed by Agenda 21, the United Nations Center for Human Settlements (Habitat), the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and the Sustainable Cities Programme.³⁶² In June 1993, Bill Clinton formed the Presidents Council on Sustainable Development (PCSD) in order to help implement the Agenda 21 program in the U.S.³⁶³

Experimental metropolitan projects in Sustainable Development, commonly known as Local Agenda 21's are being carried out around the world. In the United States, however, the Agenda 21 link is rarely, if ever, mentioned. The two cities that are leading the way in this area are Chicago and Atlanta and, not surprisingly, in many ways the projects are identical. In each case large corporate interests are the driving force behind it. Both require the creation of a new regional governing body that will control all development involving residential building plans, commercial development and transportation planning which includes limiting the use of the personal automobile and expanding mass transit. They also have two other things in common: the first is that the new regional governing bodies will have control over taxation and how the money is spent, and the second is that they will not be accountable to the taxpayers. The two projects really differ in only one way and that is how they are being implemented.

Chicago Metropolis 2020 is a group that was organized in 1996 by The American Academy of Arts and Sciences and the Commercial Club of Chicago. Its first report, *Chicago Metropolis 2020: Preparing Metropolitan Chicago for the 21st Century*, outlined a plan to improve upon regional governance for the area. Subjects that are addressed include transportation, land use and housing, children and taxation.³⁶⁴ The report states:

The economic goals of the plan are to alter these background conditions in ways that will enable and encourage the residents of metropolitan Chicago and its employers to meet the challenges of the new world order in which region competes against region and to bring about a high and sustainable level of prosperity.³⁶⁵

Elmer W. Johnson, a former executive vice president and Director of General Motors is the author of the report, which was released in March 1999. Currently, he is a partner in the law firm of Kirkland and Ellis and president of the Aspen Institute.³⁶⁶

Funding for the group is, apparently, not a major concern. A press release from the organization states that; "More than \$4 million had been raised to fund the organization over its first three years. Major donors include; The Chicago Community Trust, The Commercial Club of Chicago, The Grand Victoria Foundation, The John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, The Robert R. McCormick Tribune Foundation and Inland Steel Industries/Ryerson Tull, Inc."³⁶⁷ In addition to financial help, the Chicago project has received advice from local organizations such as: The Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago, Chicago United, Inc., Business and Professional People for the Public Interest, the Environmental Law and Policy Center and the Center for Neighborhood Technology (CNT).³⁶⁸ This last group, the CNT, is interesting because its president, Scott Bernstein, also happened to be a member of Bill Clinton's Council on Sustainable Development.³⁶⁹

The RCC will be a democratic institution in the Follett tradition, that is to say, that the individual voter will not have a say in who serves on this governing body.

Realizing that a new governmental structure would be needed and recognizing how unpopular the concept of metropolitan government is, Johnson decided that a Regional Coordination Council (RCC) should be formed instead. The RCC will be a democratic institution in the Follett tradition, that is to say, that the individual voter will not have a say in who serves on this governing body. The reason for this according to the project's first report is that, "If the trustees are elected directly by the region's voters, it is likely that many able persons will be deterred by the costs

of running for office. Further, the voters are already deluged at election time with a complexity of choices for numerous offices. This would only add to the confusion."³⁷⁰ Having eliminated the people as the electors of these trustees, the report then looked at the possibility of allowing the mayor of Chicago, the six county boards in northeastern Illinois, and the Governor of Illinois to appoint them. The downside of this proposal, according to the report, is that elected representatives may show an allegiance to their political entities and constituents.³⁷¹ The report concludes:

A third alternative, the one we recommend, would be a confederation approach giving votes to each of 270 municipalities in accordance with their relative populations and to the six counties in accordance with the populations of their unincorporated areas. An appointed blue-ribbon nominating commission would select 45 candidates for the 15 offices, taking into account the distribution of the population across the region.³⁷²

The reason that the project report is so adamant about not being accountable to the voters is that, since it is to be a taxing structure, it is feared that the common people would not understand the projects lofty goals and elect the wrong people. When asked what politicians would support the kind of tax increases that the report advocates, project director, Elmer Johnson, simply stated, "None."³⁷³ Johnson was wrong. Governor George Ryan and his Lieutenant Governor, Corinne Wood, both agreed to serve on the Executive Council of Chicago Metropolis 2020.³⁷⁴ In order to prevent a backlash against the entire concept by those office holders whose jobs would be jeopardized by the new governmental structure, the report suggests that a task force be organized. "Such a task force would design strategies for implementation of the new reforms over a period of several years so as to minimize the motivation of current office-holders to try and defeat reforms."³⁷⁵

The "crises" scenario that Jerry Mechling described is driving the Atlanta reengineering effort. Ozone levels in the region exceed those allowed by the 1990 Clean Air Act and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), while extending the deadlines for other major cities to meet the requirements has not exempted Atlanta.³⁷⁶ In order to

combat this alleged menace, the creation of a Georgia Regional Transportation Authority (GRTA) was proposed. A *Governing* magazine article noted however, "Any solution that the new authority might be tempted to impose—mass transit, zoning changes, inducements to density—could have only a marginal impact on the region's air quality." The article went on to state that, "There are feasible ways for Atlanta to get down to the 214 tons of nitrogen oxides by 2005, but they don't depend on regional planning; they depend on science."³⁷⁷

Proponents of the GRT were stuck. Here they had a radical change that they wanted to implement but no real crises with which to justify it. Things were not looking good when suddenly out of nowhere the media came to the rescue. On June 18, 1998, *The Wall Street Journal* discovered "gridlock" in Atlanta!³⁷⁸ "As the summer went on 'Georgia Gridlock' stories seemed to turn up everywhere: the *Christian Science Monitor*, *U.S. News & World Report* and NBC News."³⁷⁹ Things were getting serious. "It's not just the commute," said Richard Skinner, Clayton State College President. "It's that it takes so goddamn long to get anywhere. To go to a cocktail party in Atlanta on a Friday, you start early in the afternoon or you don't get there."³⁸⁰ This was all the encouragement that was needed. Big business interests and other area elites jumped on the gridlock bandwagon. Sam Williams, president of the Metro Atlanta Chamber of Commerce commented that; "We're going to lead this parade" and "We're not going to wait for elected officials."³⁸¹

A bill to create the GRTA passed the Georgia State legislature with the full support of Georgia Governor Roy Barnes.³⁸² Bill Byrne, an elected county official and supporter of the new regional body, described it as a dictatorial process. "We're creating an authority that gives power to one individual that has never been given to anyone, anywhere in the country."³⁸³ The board of the GRTA has 15 members that serve at the pleasure of the governor. He

"...can hire and fire any of them at will. If they vote against him, he can simply appoint a new board. He is Czar of Gridlock."³⁸⁴

Proponents of these regional government structures only talk in general terms about the amount of new taxation that they plan to impose. The Chicago Metropolis 2020 report for example, simply says that there should be a new state sales tax, an increase in the individual income tax, an increase in residential real estate property taxes and "...a combination of taxes and fees directed at the private motor vehicle."³⁸⁵ The motor vehicle tax includes: a gasoline tax increase, tolls on arterial roads, higher tolls during rush hours, increased parking taxes and higher annual registration fees. Since the goal of the motor vehicle tax increase is to get as many private automobiles off the road as possible, the question becomes: How much taxation will it require to force the bulk of the drivers off the road and on to mass transit? The London Planning Advisory Committee (LPAC), a Local Agenda 21 group in the U.K., has come up with an estimate. According to the LPAC, it will require the equivalent of about \$12,000,000 (U.S.) per car in additional taxation each year to significantly reduce traffic.³⁸⁶

"These people are centralized planners and they are not on our side."

The reaction of local government officials to these regional taxing bodies can only be described as stunned disbelief.³⁸⁷ The reason for this is not just the sheer size of the tax-and-spend aspects of these projects (the initial outlay for the Chicago plan calls for an expenditure of \$12 billion)³⁸⁸ but rather what appears to be a plan to use these taxing powers to redistribute the region's wealth.³⁸⁹ Tom Marcucci, mayor of the Chicago suburb of Elmhurst, declared that, "The guy who wrote this must be from Moscow." He then added, "These people are centralized planners and they are not on our side."³⁹⁰ While discussing the reinventing government process, Tony Blair denied

that proponents were a bunch of "...old-style socialists in drag, desperate to conceal their true identity."³⁹¹ Elmer Johnson, however, probably best summed up the situation when he stated, "In many ways we use better-off people to subsidize the rest of society."³⁹²

Over the past twelve years efforts to reinvent government have met with varying degrees of success. Here in the United States there seems to have been more success locally than nationally. The goal of creating a single all encompassing government, which was supposed to have been a reality within 24 months of Al Gore's First Service to the Citizen Conference in June of 1993, failed.³⁹³ Likewise the goal of requiring the American people to obtain a national identity card that would be required for all government services failed—so far.³⁹⁴ At the international level however, the world government agenda has moved forward without impediment. NAFTA and GATT passed both houses of Congress and George W. Bush is preparing to ram the FTAA through—once again with or without the support of the American people.

All of this activity on behalf of globalization has had a significant impact on public opinion. In 1964, 76% of the American people trusted the Government. By 1994 this number had fallen to just 21%. It recovered briefly in 1997 going as high as 38% but by 1999 it had again fallen to 29%.³⁹⁵ It took more than just GATT and NAFTA, however, to turn Americans against their government—events like the Branch Davidian incident at Waco Texas and the shootings at Ruby Ridge also played a large part in undermining this trust. While at first glance this would seem to be a positive development for proponents of world government, one should not forget the warning that Donald G. Bishop, Chairman of the International Relations Concentration at the Maxwell Graduate School of Citizenship and Public Affairs of Syracuse University, gave in 1954:

"There is no reason to believe that this trend towards greater internationalization has come to an end. The forces of nationalism are fighting a delaying action. It is unlikely that they will be able to come back and win the last decisive battle. This statement does not imply that the world will be engulfed with a rush of internationalism, but only that the long, slow steps of time march in this direction."

Some men are already formulating the constitution of a world federation. But any thought that such a goal will be achieved in the near future is too optimistic. The minds of men are not yet ready to except so great a surrender of power by national governments. Tragic as 'too little too late' may be, a far greater disaster might well result from 'too much, too soon'.[396](#)

Copyright © 2005 Robert P. Hillmann. All rights reserved.

Endnotes

[1.](#) Letter from Al Gore to the Service to the Citizens Conference dated June 18, 1993 (Originally referred to as the National Performance Review, The name was later changed to National Partnership to Reinvent Government).

[2.](#) Jerry Mechling "REENGINEERING: Part of You Game Plan? A guide for Public Managers" **Governing**. February 1994 Vol. 7 No. 5 pp.43-44. The full text of the article is available Online:<http://www.governing.com/archive/1994/feb/reeng.txt>

[3.](#) Ibid, p. 43.

[4.](#) Ibid, p. 43.

[5.](#) Ibid, p. 43.

6. Ibid, p. 43.

7. Ibid, p. 43.

8. Jerry Mechling et al. "*Customer Service Excellence— Using Information Technologies to Improve Service Delivery in Government*" (A Summary Report by The Program on Strategic Computing and Telecommunications in the Public Sector), The President and Fellows of Harvard College. June 1993, p.12.

9. Ibid, p.13.

10. Mechling, **Governing** February 1994 p.50.

11. NPRNews.COE, Pearls of NPR Wisdom; The original online bulletin board has been removed. The complete text from this site, however, is still available online at:<http://www.geocities.com/CapitolHill/4476/usarmy3r.html>.

12. Mechling, **Governing** February 1994 p.50-51.

13. Ibid, p.50.

14. Ibid, p.50.

15. David Osborne and Ted Gaebler, **Reinventing Government** (Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley 1992; Penguin Books edition) p.xvii.

16. Mechling et al. "Customer Service Excellence" p.19 / Mechling, **Governing** February 1994 p.51.

17. Mechling, **Governing** February 1994 p.51.

18. Ibid, p.50.

19. **Governing** Online: <http://www.governing.com/about.htm>

20. **Government Technology** Online: <http://www.govtech.net>

21. **Government Executive** Online: <http://www.govexec.com/>

22. Institute for Electronic Government Online: <http://www.ieg.ibm.com>
23. Alliance for Redesigning Government Online: www.alliance.napawash.org
24. Report of the First Service to the Citizen Conference; Richmond, Virginia, June 1993.
25. John Kamensky. "Role of the 'Reinventing Government' Movement in Federal Management Reform" **Public Administration Review**, May/June 1996 Vol. 56 No. 3, p.248.
26. James D. Carroll. "Introduction" **Public Administration Review**, May/June 1996 Vol. 56 No.3 p.245.
27. Paul A. Strassmann. "The Roots of Business Process Reengineering", **American Programmer**. June 1995,
Online: <http://www.strassmann.com/pubs/reeng/roots.html>
28. Dana Wechsler Linden. "The mother of them all" **Forbes**. January 16, 1995. pp. 75-76.
29. Dana Wechsler Linden. "The mother of them all" **Forbes**. pp. 75-76.
30. Mary Parker Follett "The New State: Group Organization the Solution of Popular Government" originally published: (New York : Longmans, Green Co. 1918—Reprinted by the Pennsylvania State university press 1998) p. 15 / The entire text of **The New State** can be found
Online: http://sunsite.utk.edu/FINS/Mary_Parker_Follett/Fins-MPF-01.html.
31. Ibid, p. 15.
32. Carroll Quigley, **Tragedy and Hope: A History of the World in Our Time** (New York: The Macmillan Company 1966), p. 130.
33. Carroll Quigley, **Tragedy and Hope** pp.130-132.
34. Ibid, p. 131.
35. Walter Karp "Textbook America" **Harper's** magazine, May 1980, p. 84 / Online: <http://www.sourcetext.com/grammarians/textbook2.html>.
36. Merrill F. Hartshorn, "The Improvement Of Instructional Materials" **Approaches to an Understanding of World Affairs 1954**, 25th Yearbook of
the National Council For Social Studies-National Education Association, (Menasha, Wisconsin: George Banta Publishing Co., 1954) p. 443.

[37.](#) Walter Karp "Textbook America" p. 82.

[38.](#) Ibid, p. 82.

[39.](#) Ibid, p. 82.

[40.](#) Ibid, p. 82.

[41.](#) Ibid, p. 83.

[42.](#) Ibid, p. 83.

[43.](#) Merrill F. Hartshorn "*The Improvement Of Instructional Materials*", p. 443.

[44.](#) Ibid, p. 443.

[45.](#) William Hale Thompson, "*Shall We Shatter the Nation's Idols In School Histories?*", **Current History** February 1928, Vol. XXVII No. 5, p. 622 /

Merrill F. Hartshorn "*The Improvement Of Instructional Materials*" p. 443 / Gary B. Nash "*The History Wars of the*

1990s" Online: <http://www.ecu.edu/history/Brewster/bl96.htm>.

[46.](#) The English-Speaking Union History 1918-1998, Online: <http://www.esu.org/what/history/index.asp>

[47.](#) Gary B. Nash "*The History Wars of the 1990's*" East Carolina University, November 1996, Online: <http://www.ecu.edu/history/Brewster/bl96.htm>.

[48.](#) Georg Eckert "*History Instruction and International Understanding: The Problem of Textbook Improvement*" **Approaches to an Understanding of**

World Affairs: 25th Yearbook of the National Council For Social Studies-National Education Association, (Menasha, Wisconsin: George Banta Publishing Co.,

1954) p. 431.

[49.](#) Mary Parker Follett, **The New State**, p. 162.

[50.](#) Ibid, pp. 169-170.

[51.](#) Ibid, p. 172, 165-166

[52](#). Ibid, p. 182.

[53](#). Ibid, p. 162.

[54](#). Ibid, p. 21.

[55](#). Ibid, p. 172.

[56](#). Ibid, p. 259.

[57](#). Ibid, p. 3.

[58](#). Ibid, pp.192, 245-246.

[59](#). Ibid, p. 137, 282.

[60](#). Ibid, p. 163.

[61](#). Ibid, p. 298.

[62](#). Ibid, p. 141.

[63](#). Ibid, p. 175.

[64](#). Ibid, p. 175.

[65](#). Ibid, p. 328.

[66](#). Ibid, p. 202.

[67](#). Ibid, pp. 73-74.

[68](#). Ibid, p. 207.

[69](#). Ibid, p. 363.

70. Encyclopaedia Britannica, "Socialism in one country" 1999. Online: <http://www.britannica.com/eb/article?tocId=66495&query=one&ct=eb>.

71. Charles Seymour, **The Intimate Papers of Colonel House** (Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company 1928) Volume III, pp. 169-171.

72. Ibid, Volume III, pp .170-171.

73. Ibid, Volume III, pp. 319-343.

74. Ronald Steel, **Walter Lippmann and the American Century** (Boston: Little, Brown and Company 1980) pp. 150-151.

75. Leonard Mosley, **Dulles: A biography of Eleanor, Allen and John Foster Dulles and their Family Network**. (New York: The James Press/James Wade 1978) pp. 56-56.

76. Steel, **Walter Lippmann**, pp. 152-153.

77. Clark Eichelberger, **Organizing For Peace: A personal History of the Founding of the United Nations** (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers 1977) p. 1.

78. Letter and attachment from Quincy Wright 08 March 1929, Wright Papers box 8 folders 6.

79. Carroll Quigley, **Tragedy and Hope: A History of the World in Our Time** (New York: The Macmillan Company 1966) p. 132, 946-947.

80. Paul F. Hooper, "A Brief History of the Institute of Pacific Relations" Online: <http://mcel.pacificu.edu/aspac/papers/scholars/hooper/hooper.htm> -

This article was published previously as *Rediscovering the IPR: Proceedings of the First International Research Conference on the Institute of International Relations* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Center for Arts and Humanities, 1994) pp. 110-42.

81. Ibid.

82. Ibid.

83. Ibid.

[84.](#) League of Nations Association Records, 1916, 1922—1945, Swarthmore College Peace Collection,

Online: <http://www.swarthmore.edu/Library/peace/CDGA.A-L/leagueofnationsassoc.htm> - Also see Fosdick, Raymond Blaine (1883-1972) United Nations Library,

Online: <http://www.indiana.edu/~league/americans.htm>.

[85.](#) Letter From Eichelberger dated 23 January 1951, Wright Paper, Adenda I - Lippmann Folder.

[86.](#) Harris Foundation Committee meeting notes for 14 July 1925, Wright Papers, box 8, folder 1 / Letter from Wright to W.E. Sealock 14 November 1930, Wright Papers box 8, folder 4.

[87.](#) Letter from Wright to Alberto Mascarenas, Sub-Secretary, Department of Finance, Mexico City, Mexico 25 February 1926, Wright Papers box 8, folder 1.

[88.](#) *"The Norman Wait Harris Memorial Foundation In International Relations: A tribute and Bibliography Honoring the Work of the Foundation Over Fifty Years and Accompanying a University of Chicago Archives Exhibition"*, (The Joseph Regenstein Library 1975). p. 2.

[89.](#) Letter from Wright to Alberto Mascarenas, Sub-Secretary, Department of Finance, Mexico City, Mexico 25 February 1926, Wright Papers box 8 folder 1 also see Harris Foundation Committee meeting notes for 14 July 1925, Wright Papers box 8 folder 1.

[90.](#) *"The Norman Wait Harris Memorial Foundation In International Relations"*, p. 2.

[91.](#) Letter (copy) from Frank B. Kellogg to H.F. Arthur , Esquire, Counselor, American Embassy, Mexico City 11 May 1926, Wright Papers box 8 Folder 1.

[92.](#) Letter from Wright to Max Henrici of **The Pittsburgh Sun**, 01 June 1927, Wright Papers box 8 folder 2.

[93.](#) Letter from Tiffany Blake to Wright 08 June 1933, Wright Papers box 8 folder 7.

[94.](#) *"The Norman Wait Harris Memorial Foundation In International Relations"*, pp. 3-4.

[95.](#) Letter from Douglas to Wright 07 November 1927, Wright Papers box 8 folder 3 also see Letter from Wright to Robert Hutchins 15 June 1933 box 8 folder 7.

[96.](#) Letter from Walter Lichtenstein to Wright 23 May 1928, Wright Papers box 8 folder 3.

[97.](#) Letter from Wright to E.C. Carter, 23 December 1926, Wright Papers box 8 folder 2.

[98.](#) Letter from Wright to Isabel McLaughlin, 30 April 1927, Wright Papers box 8 folder 2.

[99.](#) Letter from Stephen P. Duugan to Robert M. Htchins 31 January 1930, Wright Papers box 8 folder 4.

[100.](#) Letter from Edward Carter to Mrs. William G. Hibbard 04 October 1927, Wright Papers box 10 folder 3.

[101.](#) Letter from Stephen P. Duugan to Robert M. Htchins 31 January 1930, Wright Papers box 8 folder 4.

[102.](#) Carroll Quigley, **Tragedy and Hope**, pp. 946-947.

[103.](#) Merrill F. Hartshorn "*The Improvement Of Instructional Materials*", p. 445.

[104.](#) Ibid, pp. 443-445.

[105.](#) Ibid, p. 445.

[106.](#) Gary B. Nash "*The History Wars of the 1990's*".

[107.](#) Gary B. Nash "*The History Wars of the 1990's*" (see Nash footnote no. # 22).

[108.](#) Barry D. Karl, "Charles E. Merriam: An Introduction to the man & His Papers" (Accompanying an Exhibition from the University of Chicago

Archives at the Joseph Regenstein Library 1975).

[109.](#) William H. Stuart, **The Twenty Incredible Years**, (Chicago: M.A. Donohoue & Co. 1935) p. 72.

[110.](#) Lloyd Wendt and Herman Kogan, **Big Bill of Chicago** (Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc. 1953) p. 163.

[111.](#) William H. Stuart, **The Twenty Incredible Years**, p. 72.

[112.](#) Ibid, pp. 92-93.

[113.](#) Lloyd Wendt and Herman Kogan, **Big Bill of Chicago**, pp. 206-213 also see Barry D. Karl, "*Charles E. Merriam.*"

[114.](#) Lloyd Wendt and Herman Kogan, **Big Bill of Chicago**, p. 236.

[115.](#) Douglas Bukowski, **Big Bill Thompson, Chicago, and the Politics of Image**, (Urbana: University of Illinois Press 1998) p. 152.

[116.](#) William H. Stuart, **The Twenty Incredible Years**, pp. 188-189.

[117.](#) William Hale Thompson, **Current History** February 1928, p. 619.

[118.](#) William H. Stuart, **The Twenty Incredible Years**, pp. 292-297.

[119.](#) Ibid, p. 318.

[120.](#) Lloyd Wendt and Herman Kogan, **Big Bill of Chicago**, p. 291.

[121.](#) Ibid, p. 291

[122.](#) Gary B. Nash "*The History Wars of the 1990's*" (see footnote no. # 08).

[123.](#) Douglas Bukowski, **Big Bill Thompson**, p. 248.

[124.](#) Ibid.

[125.](#) Letter from Carter to Wright 03 May 1932, Wright Papers box 10 folder 15.

[126.](#) Letter from Wright to Carter 07 May 1932, Wright Papers box 10 folder 15 (emphasis added).

[127.](#) Letter from Carter to Wright 03 May 1932.

[128.](#) Letter from Carter to Wright 03 May 1932, Wright Papers box 10 folder 15.

[129.](#) Members of the American Council Institute of Pacific Relations as of October 31, 1928, box 10, folder 8, Quincy Wright Papers, University of

Chicago Library.

[130.](#) Paul F. Hooper, "*A Brief History of the Institute of Pacific Relations*".

131. Members of the American Council Institute of Pacific Relations, box 10, folder 8, Wright Papers.

132. Members of the American Council Institute of Pacific Relations as of October 31, 1928, Wright Papers, box 10 folder 8.

133. Paul F. Hooper, "*A Brief History of the Institute of Pacific Relations*" Letters between Wright and Carter, Wright Papers box 10 folder 3 / Carroll Quigley, **Tragedy and Hope**, p. 944.

134. Paul F. Hooper, "*A Brief History of the Institute of Pacific Relations*".

135. Letter from Schoenfeld to Wright 20 May 1926 and Kellogg to Schoenfeld 11 May 1926, Wright, Wright Papers box 8 folder 1.

136. Letters from Feis to Wright 09 April and 09 June 1931 Papers box 8 Folder 5.

137. Letter from Schoenfeld to Wright 20 May 1926 and Kellogg to Schoenfeld 11 May 1926, Wright, Wright Papers box 8 folder 1.

138. Letter from Wright to Samuel N. Harper 28 October 1932, Wright Papers box 8 folder 7.

139. Trotsky, Leon, Britannica Online: <http://www.britannica.com/eb/article?tocId=9073511&query=trotsky&ct=>.

140. William P. Bundy, *The Council on Foreign Relations and Foreign Affairs: Notes for a History*.

141. Letter from Skvirsky to Wright 17 May 1933, Wright Papers box 8 folder 7.

142. Letter from Wright to Edward C. Carter 13 June 1933, Wright Papers box 8 folder 7.

143. Letter from Harper to Bernadette Schmitt 23 September 1934, Wright Papers box 8 folder 9 / Letter from Harper to Bernadette Schmitt 28 October 1934, Wright Papers box 8 folder 9 / Letter from Bernadette Schmitt to Harper 25 October 1934, Wright Papers box 8 folder 9.

144. Telegram from Harper to Wright 25 February 1935, Wright Papers box 8 folder 9.

145. "*U. of C. Obtains 3 Soviet Chiefs as Lecturers*", **Chicago Tribune** 11 June 1935, Section 1, p. 9.

146. Ibid.

147. Letter from Wright to Harris 12 June 1935, Wright Papers box 8 folder 9.

148. Letter from Woodward to Wright 20 November 1926, Wright Papers box 8 folder 1.

149. Ibid.

150. Radek, Karl Britannica Online: <http://www.britannica.com/eb/article?tocId=9062388&query=Radek%2C%20Karl&ct=>

151. R. Palme Dutt, **World Politics: 1918-1936** (London: Victor Gollancz Ltd. 1936) pp. 48-49.

152. Carroll Quigley, **Tragedy and Hope**, pp. 938-956.

153. William P. Bundy, *The Council on Foreign Relations and Foreign Affairs: A Brief History*. Online: <http://www.foreignaffairs.org/about/history2>.

154. Clark Eichelberger, **Organizing For Peace**, pp. 60-65.

155. Letter from Charles Fenwick to Wright 15 January 1939, Quincy Wright Papers box five folder 11.

156. Letter to Carter Wright 03 March 1941, Quincy Wright Papers box 10 folder 15.

157. Ibid.

158. Clark Eichelberger, **Organizing For Peace**, p. 114.

159. Ibid, p. 108.

160. Ibid, pp. 106-111.

161. Ibid, pp. 119-120.

162. Ibid, pp. 136-144.

163. Ibid, p. 145.

164. Ibid, pp. 145-146.

[165.](#) Ibid, p. 198.

[166.](#) Members of the Commission to Study the Organization of Peace, Wright Papers box 5 folder 12 also see letterhead of Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies 13 June 1940, Wright Papers box 6 folder 10.

[167.](#) Commission to Study the Organization of Peace, **Building Peace: Reports of the Commission to Study the Organization of Peace**, volume 1 (Metuchen , New Jersey: Scarecrow Press, 1973) p. xii-xiii.

[168.](#) Robert P. Hillmann, "*Quincy Wright and the Commission to Study the Organization of Peace*" **Global Governance** Volume 4 No. 4, pp. 486-487.

[169.](#) Stuart, **The Twenty Incredible Years**, p. 250.

[170.](#) Carroll Quigley, **Tragedy and Hope**, p. 946.

[171.](#) Harry Elmer Barnes et al, "*Tin Cans and Peace*" 24 February 1940, p. 1, Wright Papers box 5 folder 12.

[172.](#) Commission of Enquiry Statement 02 October 1939, p. 2 Wright Papers box five folder 12.

[173.](#) Ibid, p.2.

[174.](#) Eichelberger, **Organizing for Peace**, p. 111.

[175.](#) Commission of Enquiry Statement 02 October 1939, p. 2 Wright Papers box five folder 12.

[176.](#) Eichelberger, **Organizing for Peace**, pp. 217-218.

[177.](#) Ibid., p. 112.

[178.](#) Ibid., p. 112.

[179.](#) Letter from Lovell to Wright 13 November 1941, Wright Papers box 94 Maroon folder.

[180.](#) **The Baltimore News-Post** (War Extra Edition), "*Sees U.S.-Britain Union for Peace*" Monday December 8, 1941, p. 2.

181. Ibid.

182. Clyde Eagleton, some General Proposals, p. 1, Wright Papers box 5 folder 12.

183. Ibid, p. 1.

184. Ibid, p. 1.

185. Commission to Study the Organization of Peace, *Building Peace* p. 112.

186. *The Baltimore News-Post* (War Extra Edition), "Sees U.S.-Britain Union for Peace" Monday December 8, 1941, p. 2.

187. Commission to Study the Organization of Peace, *Building Peace*, pp. 116-117.

188. Letter from Wright to McKee, 20 March 1940, Wright Papers box 5 folder 12.

189. *The Baltimore News-Post* (War Extra Edition), "Sees U.S.-Britain Union for Peace" Monday December 8, 1941, p. 2.

190. Letter from Wright to McKee, 20 March 1940, Wright Papers box 5 folder 12.

191. Commission to Study the Organization of Peace, *Building Peace*, p. 6.

192. Ibid, p. 6.

193. Letter from Wright to Shotwell, 01 July 1940, Wright Papers box 23 Shotwell folder.

194. Letter from Wright to *The Daily Maroon*, 16 February 1940, Wright Papers box 94 Maroon folder.

195. Commission to Study the Organization of Peace, *Building Peace*, p. 30.

196. Letter from Shotwell to Wright 01 April 1940, Wright Papers box 5 folder 12.

197. Richard N. Gardner, *Franklin Roosevelt and World Order: The World We Sought and the World We Have*, United States Embassy-Madrid, Spain;

Online: <http://www.geocities.com/CapitolHill/4476/turineng.html>.

198. Ibid.

199. Commission to Study the Organization of Peace, *Building Peace*, p. 22 also see Richard N. Gardner, Franklin Roosevelt and *World Order: The World We Sought and the World We Have*.

200. Commission to Study the Organization of Peace, *Building Peace*, p. 65.

201. Ibid, p. 65.

202. Ibid, p. 15.

203. Robert E. Sherwood, **Roosevelt and Hopkins: An Intimate History** (New York: Harper and Brothers 1948) p. 458 also see: Clark Eichelberger, **Organizing for Peace**, pp. 188-189.

204. Clark Eichelberger, **Organizing for Peace**, p. 240.

205. The Avalon Project at the Yale Law School, Declaration by the United Nations,
Online: <http://www.yale.edu/lawweb/avalon/decade/decade03.htm>.

206. The Avalon Project at the Yale Law School, Atlantic Charter, Online: <http://www.yale.edu/lawweb/avalon/wwii/atlantic.htm>.

207. Clark Eichelberger, **Organizing for Peace**, p. 218.

208. Henry A. Wallace, "Tribute To Russia" (Forward by Corliss Lamont) published by: The Congress of American-Soviet Friendship, p. 5.

209. Ibid, p. 9.

210. Ibid, p. 9.

211. Ibid, pp 11-12.

212. Ibid, pp. 9-11.

213. Clark Eichelberger, **Organizing for Peace**, pp. 236-237.

[214](#). Ibid. p. 241.

[215](#). Carroll Quigley **Tragedy and Hope**, p. 946.

[216](#). Letters between Lamont and Wright, Wright Papers box 43 Asia Society folder.

[217](#). Preliminary list: Congress of American Soviet-Friendship, Wright Papers box 43 Asia Society folder also see partial list of the sponsors of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, Wright Papers box 43 Asia Society folder.

[218](#). Preliminary list: Congress of American Soviet-Friendship, Wright Papers box 43 Asia Society folder.

[219](#). Letter from Quincy Wright to Harriet Moore 10 February 1943, Wright Papers box 43 Asia Society folder.

[220](#). See letterhead of The American Russian Institute 05 May 1939, Wright Papers box 43 Asia Society folder—Letter from Carter to Louise Wright 25 July 1946 also see: entry for Edward C. Carter in **Who's Who In America** volume 25, 1948-1949 (Chicago: The A.N. Marquis Company 1948) pp. 405-406.

[221](#). Ronald H. Spector **Eagle Against The Sun** (New York: The Free Press 1985) p..368-369.

[222](#). Letter from Kohlberg to Carter 09 November 1944, Wright Papers box 10 folder 16.

[223](#). Ibid.

[224](#). Carroll Quigley, **Tragedy and Hope**, p. 946.

[225](#). Letter from Kohlberg to Carter 09 November 1944, Wright Papers box 10 folder 16.

[226](#). Letters from Stephen Duggan 11 December 1944, Wright Papers box 10 folder 5.

[227](#). Ibid.

[228](#). Ibid.

[229](#). Clark Eichelberger, **Organizing for Peace**, pp. 260-261.

[230.](#) Letter from Quincy Wright to the editor of the *Chicago Journal of Commerce* 13 August 1946, Wright Papers box 10 folder 16.

[231.](#) Letter from Edward C. Carter to Louise Wright 18 July 1946, Wright Papers box 10 folder 16.

[232.](#) Letter from Edward C. Carter to Louise Wright 25 July 1946, Wright Papers box 10 folder 16.

[233.](#) Ibid.

[234.](#) Ibid.

[235.](#) Letter from The American Russian Institute 05 May 1939 (see Board of Directors list), Wright Papers box 43 Asia Society folder.

[236.](#) The Congress of American Soviet Friendship, Patrons and Patronesses (Preliminary List), Wright Papers box 43 Asia Society folder.

[237.](#) Letter from Edward C. Carter to Louise Wright 25 July 1946, Wright Papers box 10 folder 16.

[238.](#) *Who's Who In America*, Volume 25, 1948-1949 (Chicago: A. N. Marquis Company 1948) p. 805.

[239.](#) *Who's Who In America*, Volume 25, p. 2754.

[240.](#) Letterhead Chicago Council of American-Soviet Friendship 17 December 1945, Wright Papers box 43 Asia Society folder.

[241.](#) Letter from Fisher to Louise Wright 31 July 1946, Wright Papers box 10 folder 16.

[242.](#) Ibid.

[243.](#) Carroll Quigley, *Tragedy and Hope*, p. 950.

[244.](#) Ibid, pp. 954-955.

[245.](#) Letter from Fisher to Louise Wright 31 July 1946, Wright Papers box 10 folder 16.

[246.](#) Letter from Quincy Wright to the Editor of *The Chicago Journal of Commerce* 13 August 1946, Wright Papers box 10 folder 16.

[247.](#) Willard Edwards "Radicals, Rich Unite to Push World State," *Chicago Daily Tribune* 06 August 1946, pp. 1,4.

[248.](#) Willard Edwards "Radicals, World Staters Wage An Atomic War of Nerves," *Chicago Daily Tribune* 08 August 1946, p. 4.

[249.](#) Ibid.

[250.](#) Ibid.

[251.](#) Ibid.

[252.](#) Ibid.

[253.](#) Ibid.

[254.](#) Willard Edwards "Radicals, Rich Unite to Push World State", p. 4.

[255.](#) Willard Edwards "World Staters Wage An Atomic War of Nerves," p. 4.

[256.](#) Willard Edwards "Radicals, Rich Unite to Push World State," p. 4.

[257.](#) Eichelberger **Organizing For Peace**, p. 198.

[258.](#) Ibid, p. 245.

[259.](#) Walter Trohan "U.N. New Order Propaganda to Begin at Cradle," *Chicago Daily Tribune* 11 August 1946, part 1 p. 11.

[260.](#) Ibid.

[261.](#) Letter from Leonard S. Kenworthy to Quincy Wright 04 July 1947, Wright Papers box 13 folder 9.

[262.](#) Ibid.

[263.](#) Merrill F. Hartshorn "The Improvement Of Instructional Materials", p. 463.

[264.](#) Letter from Quincy Wright to Leonard S. Kenworthy 19 September 1947, Wright Papers box 13 folder 9.

[265.](#) Ibid.

[266](#). Ibid.

[267](#). Letter from Milton Eisenhower to Quincy Wright 14 January 1949, Wright Papers box 13 folder 9.

[268](#). Letter from William C. Johnstone, Director Office of Educational Exchange, Department of State to Quincy Wright 01 March 1949, Wright Papers box 13 folder 9.

[269](#). Letter from Carter to Dean, Lancaster, Kissel and Wright 27 February 1947, Wright Papers box 10 folder 16.

[270](#). Ibid.

[271](#). Ibid.

[272](#). Ibid.

[273](#). Ibid.

[274](#). Notice of Special Meeting and proxy ballot, Wright Papers box 10 folder 16.

[275](#). Nate White "Officials of Pacific Institute Cleared of Communist Taint," *The Christian Science Monitor* 23 April 1947 (reprint by IPR), Wright Papers box 10 folder 16.

[276](#). Ibid.

[277](#). Letter from Carter to IPR members 01 May 1947, Wright Papers box 10 folder 16.

[278](#). Ibid.

[279](#). Foster Rhea Dulles **America's Rise To World Power 1898-1954** (New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers 1954) pp. 250-251.

[280](#). Ibid, p. 252.

[281](#). Carroll Quigley **Tragedy and Hope**, pp. 931-932.

[282](#). Carroll Quigley **Tragedy and Hope**, p. 933.

[283](#). Letter from Holland to IPR members 14 February 1951, Wright Papers box 10 folder 17.

[284](#). Ibid.

[285](#). Press Release by William Holland 16 February 1951, Wright Papers box 10 folder 17.

[286](#). Ibid.

[287](#). Ibid.

[288](#). Letter from Gerard Swope to Senator Homer Ferguson 21 February 1951, Wright Papers box 10 folder 17.

[289](#). Ibid.

[290](#). Ibid.

[291](#). Letter from Holland to Mundt 23 February 1951, Wright Papers box 10 folder 17.

[292](#). Fulton Lewis Jr. "Lattimore's Leftist Defenders" *Chicago Herald-American* 13 March 1953 p. 17, Wright Papers box 16 folder 10.

[293](#). Ibid.

[294](#). Carroll Quigley **Tragedy and Hope**, pp. 954-955.

[295](#). Ibid, p. 955.

[296](#). Ibid, p. 955.

[297](#). Arthur Herman **Joseph McCarthy: Re-examining the Life and Legacy of America's Most Hated Senator** (New York: The Free Press 2000)

pp. 252-253.

[298](#). Letter from Stephen Duggan to Dr. Chang Poling 11 December 1944 (see letterhead), Wright Papers box 10 folder 5.

299. Members of the American Council Institute of Pacific Relations, Wright Papers box 10 folder 8 also see Commission to Study the Organization of Peace, **Building Peace** pp. xv-xviii.

300. Arthur Herman **Joseph McCarthy**, p. 254.

301. Howard R. Anderson **Approaches to an Understanding of World Affairs**, pp. ix-x.

302. Richard N. Gardner **Franklin Roosevelt and World Order**. Online: <http://www.geocities.com/CapitolHill/4476/turineng.html>.

303. Remarks by Ambassador Cynthia P. Schneider at the American European Community Association Rijswijk, September 28, 1999, *Two Unions: The United States and The European Union*, Online: <http://www.usemb.nl/092899.htm>.

304. Ibid.

305. EU in Brief, Online: <http://www.eurunion.org/profile/brief.htm>.

306. Ibid.

307. Philip Johnson, **Home Affairs** Editor "*Alarm over Euro-wide justice plan*" Electronic Telegraph (The Daily Telegraph) 30 November 1998, Online: <http://www.telegraph.co.uk>.

308. Ambrose Evans-Pritchard "*Euro-court outlaws criticism of EU*" Electronic Telegraph (The Daily Telegraph) 07 March 2001.

309. Ambrose Evans-Pritchard "*Eurofile: EU suppression of criticism smacks of fascism*" Electronic Telegraph (The Daily Telegraph) 10 March 2001.

310. Andrew Gimson, Toby Helm and George Jones "*Germany prepares to push for single European state*" Electronic Telegraph (The Daily Telegraph) 26 November 1998, Online: <http://www.telegraph.co.uk>.

311. Ibid.

312. George Jones, "*Blair: I want to end the uncertainty and Europhobia*" Electronic Telegraph (The Daily Telegraph) 14 May 1999, Online: <http://www.telegraph.co.uk>.

313. George Jones, Michael Smith and Andrew Sparrow, "*Burton pledges 12,000 to Euro-army*" *Electronic Telegraph* (The Daily Telegraph) 21

November 2000, Online: <http://www.telegraph.co.uk>.

314. Laurence McQuillan, *Clinton: "Tide of Change" Sweeping the World*, Reuters Friday October 19, 1997, 4:50 PM EDT Buenos Aires

Online: <http://dailynews.yahoo.com>.

315. Press Statement by James P. Rubin, Spokesman June 15, 1998, "*Announcement of the Secretary's Intention To Create a Bureau of Western Hemispheric Affairs*," U.S. Department of State Office of the Spokesman, Online: <http://www.geocities.com/CapitolHill/4476/westhem01.html>. For more current information on the creation of the unification of the hemisphere see: The Bureau of Western Hemisphere Affairs site Online: <http://www.state.gov/p/wha/>

316. Col. Michael Dziedzic "*NAFTA and North American Security*" Institute for National Strategic Studies-National Defense University, Strategic Forum No. 18, January 1995, Online: <http://www.geocities.com/CapitolHill/4476/forum18.html>.

317. Ibid.

318. Ibid.

319. Ibid.

320. DefenseLINK, U.S. Department of Defense Press Advisory Number: No. 210-P, July 19, 1995

Online: http://www.defenselink.mil/news/Jul1995/p071995_p210-95.html.

321. Max G. Manwaring "*Security of the Western Hemisphere: International Terrorism and Organized Crime*" Institute for National Strategic Studies-National Defense University, Strategic Forum No. 137, April 1998, Online: <http://www.geocities.com/CapitolHill/4476/forum137.html>.

322. Ibid.

323. Western Hemisphere Institute for Security Cooperation Activation Ceremony Remarks as Delivered by Deputy Secretary of Defense Rudy de Leon, Fort Benning, Georgia, Wednesday, 17 January 2001, Online: <http://www.defenselink.mil/speeches/2001/s20010117-depsecdef.html>.

324. Sebastian Edwards "*How About a Single Currency for Mercosur?*" *Wall Street Journal* Interactive Edition, Editorial 28 August 1998
Online: <http://interactive.wsj.com/>.

325. Associated Press "In Canada and Mexico, Experts Float Idea of a NAFTA-Style Euro" **Chicago Tribune** January 19, 1999,

Online: <http://chicagotribune.com/>.

326. Reuters "Argentina sees dollar as possible Americas Currency" Buenos Aires, 15 January 1999, Yahoo

Online: <http://biz.yahoo.com/rf/pp0115/eu.html>.

327. Michael W. Everett "Multiculturalism in Southeast Asia" Institute for National Strategic Studies \u2013 National Defense University, Strategic

Forum Number 33, September 1996 Online: http://www.ndu.edu/inss/strforum/SF_33/forum33.html. Also see the Symposium Summary

at http://www.ndu.edu/inss/strforum/SF_33/forum33s.html.

328. Ibid.

329. Neal Pierce "ARE AMERICA'S 'CITISTATES' READY TO COMPETE?" **Governing** October 1993 vol.7 no. 1 p.10.

330. R.C. Longworth "Nationhood Under Siege" **Chicago Tribune** October 25, 1998.

331. George Bush, Address to the Nation Announcing Allied Military Action in the Persian Gulf (1991)

Online: <http://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/georgebushwhiletheworldwaited.htm>.

332. R.C. Longworth "End of Sovereignty" **Chicago Tribune** September 19, 1993 Section 4 Perspective, p. 1.

333. Ibid.

334. Tony Blair "Doctrine of International Community" to the Economic Club of Chicago, April 22, 1999 Online: [http://www.number-](http://www.number-10.gov.uk/output/Page1297.asp)

[10.gov.uk/output/Page1297.asp](http://www.number-10.gov.uk/output/Page1297.asp).

335. J.R. Wilson "ARPA Unveils Technology Plan" **Military & Aerospace Electronics** December 1994, Vol. 5 No. 3, p. 29.

336. Art Pine "About-Face for Military: Troops Focus on Peace" (S) **Chicago Sun-Times** June 29, 1994 p. 32.

337. Advertisement for West '95 "Operations Other Than War" **Military & Aerospace Electronics** December 1994, Vol. 5 No. 3, p. 29.

338. "NATO Exercises To Be Held in U.S." **Chicago Sun-Times** August 7, 1995 p. 14.

339. Nation Briefs, **Chicago Sun-Times** October 27, 1995 p. 26 s.

340. "Marines land here to study for urban battles of future" **Chicago Sun-Times** May 5, 1998 Online: <http://www.suntimes.com>.

341. Thomas E. Ricks "Pentagon Proposes Domestic Response to Terrorist Attacks in New Budget" **The Wall Street Journal** Interactive Edition February 1, 1999 Online: <http://interactive.wsj.com>.

342. Al Gore "Reengineering Through Information Technology" Accompanying Report of the National Performance Review, U.S. Government Printing Office September 1993, pp. 29-31.

343. M.J. Zuckerman "Targeting Cyberterrorism" **USA TODAY** October 20, 1997 p. 17A.

344. Ibid, p. 17A.

345. Tony Blair "Doctrine of International Community" to the Economic Club of Chicago, April 22, 1999.

346. Alpheus Thomas Mason "Brandeis and the Modern State" Princeton University Press 1933 p. 3.

347. "This Most Illiberal Court" Editorial **Wall Street Journal** June 28, 1996 p. A10.

348. David G. Savage "Scalia considers himself 'outsider' on Supreme Court" **Chicago Sun-Times** July 23, 1996 p. 18.

349. Dick Arney "One the abuse of Executive Orders" Freedom Works: The Home Page of House Majority Leader Dick Arney, Online: www.house.gov/library/xo/amdt-speech.asp.

350. Ibid.

351. Donna DeLa Cruz "NYPD To Seize Drunken Drivers' Cars" New York (Associated Press) January 21, 1999.

352. "New Orleans Sues Gun-Makers To Recoup Costs—WSJ" New York (Reuters) November 2, 1998 Online: <http://dailynews.yahoo.com>.

353. Eugene Volokh "Guns and the Constitution" **The Wall Street Journal** Interactive Edition, Rule of Law, April 112, 1999 Online: <http://interactive.wsj.com>.

354. Gary B. Nash "The History Wars of the 1990's" East Carolina University, November 1996, Online: <http://www.ecu.edu/history/Brewster/bl96.htm>.

355. Lynne V. Cheney, "The End of History" *The Wall Street Journal* 28 October 1994, p. A24.

356. Christina L'Homme, "History: Beyond the Battlefield" UNESCO Sources, No. 120, February 2000, p. 4 also see Contents page, Online: Link to PDF version of entire February 2000 issue of UNESCO Sources: http://unesdoc.unesco.org/ulis/cgi-bin/ulis.pl?database=srsc&set=3A90C368_0_4&ref
<http://www.unesco.org/general/eng/publish/sources/sources.html#scroll=8>

Text version of article available at Britannica Online: <http://www.britannica.com/bcom/magazine/article/0,5744,350036,00.html?query=georg%20eckert>.

357. David Sitarz "AGENDA 21" (Boulder Colorado: EARTH PRESS 1994), pp. iii-vii.

358. Neil Peirce "ARE AMERICA'S CITIZENS READY TO COMPETE?" *Governing* October 1993 Vol. 7 No. 1 pp.11-12.

359. Kenichi Ohmae "New World Order: The Rise of the Region-State" *Wall Street Journal*. August 16, 1994.

360. Ibid.

361. Neal Pierce, *Governing* October 1993 p. 11.

362. "Sustainable Cities Program" United Nations Centre for Human Settlements (Habitat) and United Nations Environmental Programme (UNEP).

363. "SUSTAINABLE AMERICA—a New Consensus" President's Council on Sustainable Development (U.S. Government Printing Office 1996) p. 2

- also see PCSD Internet site Online:http://clinton2.nara.gov/PCSD/Publications/TF_Reports/amer-top.html.

364. Elmer W. Johnson "Chicago Metropolis 2020: Preparing Metropolitan Chicago for the 21st Century" (The Commercial Club of Chicago 1999)

Table of Contents - Report also available Online:<http://www.chicagometropolis2020.org/plan.pdf>. Full text copies of all their subsequent reports may be found

Online: http://www.chicagometropolis2020.org/25_3.htm

365. Elmer W. Johnson "Chicago Metropolis 2020" p. 60.

366. Elmer W. Johnson "Chicago Metropolis 2020" back of title page and *Chicago Metropolis 2020* Background. Also see Johnson's personal biography at Jenner & Block Online:<http://www.jenner.com/people/bio.asp?id=972>

[367.](#) Press Release "Chicago Metropolis 2020 Begins Operations," 01 March 1999, p. 4.

[368.](#) Chicago Metropolis Report, p. i.

[369.](#) President's Council On Sustainable Development, Members, Online: <http://clinton2.nara.gov/PCSD/Members>.

[370.](#) Chicago Metropolis Report, p. 99.

[371.](#) Ibid, pp. 99-100.

[372.](#) Ibid, p. 100.

[373.](#) Rogers Worthington interview with Elmer Johnson, *Chicago Tribune* February 28, 1999, Online: <http://chicagotribune.com>.

[374.](#) Chicago Metropolis 2020 Executive Council Members List.

[375.](#) Chicago Metropolis Report, p. 101.

[376.](#) Alan Ehrenhalt "The Czar of Gridlock" *Governing* May 1999 Vol. 12 No. 8, p. 20. Full text of the article is available

Online: <http://www.governing.com/archive/1999/may/atlanta.txt>

[377.](#) Ibid, p. 21.

[378.](#) Ibid, p. 22.

[379.](#) Ibid, p. 22.

[380.](#) Ibid, p. 22.

[381.](#) Ibid, p. 22.

[382.](#) Ibid, pp. 22-23.

[383.](#) Ibid, p. 20.

384. Ibid, p. 20.

385. Chicago Metropolis Report, p. 31.

386. Paul Marston "City drivers face 7,000-a-year charges" **The Electronic Telegraph**, 15 January 1999, Online: <http://www.telegraph.co.uk>.

387. Gary Washburn et al "Broad Civic Blueprint Targets Sprawl, Education", **Chicago Tribune** 20 November 1998 Online: <http://chicagotribune.com>.

388. Dave McKinney and Matt Adrian "Ryan unveils \$ 12 billion plan", **Chicago Sun-Times** 05 May 1999 Online: <http://www.suntimes.com>.

389. Chicago Metropolis Report, p. 98.

390. Gary Washburn et al, "Broad Civic Blueprint Targets Sprawl, Education". **Chicago Tribune** 20 November 1998.

391. Tony Blair, "Doctrine of International Community".

392. Rogers Worthington "Elmer Johnson", **Chicago Tribune** 28 February 1999 Online: <http://chicagotribune.com>.

393. Report of the First Service to the Citizen Conference, Richmond, Virginia, June 1993 p. 5.

394. Ibid, p. 8.

395. Brian Friel "Trust in government on the decline again" **Government Executive**, 13 July 1999,

Online: <http://www.govexec.com/dailyfed/0799/071399b1.htm>.

396. Donald G. Bishop, "Nations Cooperate" *Approaches to an Understanding of World Affairs: 25th Yearbook of the National Council For Social Studies-National Education Association*, (Menasha, Wisconsin: George Banta Publishing Co., 1954) pp. 79-80.